

# **A PHILOSOPHICAL STUDY OF ALTERNATIVES TO PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

**PRISCILLA BOOYSEN**

*Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the  
degree of Master of Education in the Faculty of Education  
at Stellenbosch University*



**Supervisor: Prof B van Wyk**

**December 2015**

## **DECLARATION**

By submitting this thesis electronically I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: December 2015

Copyright © 2015 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

## ABSTRACT

This study explores the structural and conceptual notions underlying educational philanthropy. I hold that many stakeholders in their private and public capacity are assisting and contributing toward quality education for children in South Africa. The concept of help or assistance is understood to be called philanthropy. I therefore constructed and synthesised the concept of educational philanthropy. Different stakeholders practise educational philanthropy in different ways due to various conceptions and understandings. I therefore contend that, in order to assist in education, which is a complex environment, one needs to understand the meanings behind the concepts of educational philanthropy.

I have chosen philosophical inquiry to provide me with the conceptual tools to explore and clarify my research question. I have employed three methods of inquiry, namely conceptual analysis, exploring hidden assumptions underlying a particular view or broader school of thought, and questioning the practice of educational philanthropy in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the meaning of concepts. I have also used interpretive inquiry and critical theory as my research methodologies.

The findings indicate that the literature confirmed my perception that there are different meanings and hidden assumptions attached to the concept of educational philanthropy. This study thus allowed me to gain a better and deeper academic understanding of the concepts I am engaging with in my practice on a daily basis.

**KEYWORDS:** Philosophy of education, conceptual analysis, educational philanthropy, alternative practices

## OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie ondersoek die strukturele en konseptuele konsepte onderliggend aan opvoedkundige filantropie. Ek is van mening dat verskeie belangegroepe in hulle private en publieke kapasiteit ondersteuning bied en bydrae maak tot kwaliteit opvoeding vir kinders in Suid- Afrika. Die konsep van ondersteuning of help word ook filantropie genoem. In verwysing daarna het ek dus die konsep ‘opvoedkundige filantropie’ gekonstrueer. Verskillende belangegroepe voer opvoedkundige filantropie op verskillende wyses uit weens hulle verskillende konsepsies en begrippe. Ek argumenteer dus dat ten einde opvoeding, wat ’n komplekse omgewing is, te ondersteun, ’n indiepte begrip van die bedoelings agter die konsep van opvoedkundige filantropie nodig is en alternatiewe praktyke ondersoek moet word.

Ek het ’n filosofiese ondersoek gekies as die mees toepaslike navorsingsbenadering om aan my die nodige konseptuele toerusting te bied om my navorsingsvraag te verhelder en te ondersoek. Ek het drie metodes van ondersoek gebruik, naamlik konseptuele analise, die verkenning van versteekte aannames onderliggend aan ’n spesifieke denkskool, en die ondervraging van die praktyk van opvoedkundige filantropie ten einde ’n diepgaande begrip te kry van die konsepte wat ek ondersoek. Interpretatiewe ondersoek en kritiese teorie is as navorsingsmetodologieë aangewend.

Die bevindinge dui aan dat die literatuur my persepsie bevestig dat verskillende bedoelinge en versteekte aannames oor die konsep van opvoedkundige filantropie bestaan. Hierdie studie het dus toegelaat dat ek ’n beter en diepgaande akademiese begrip van die konsepte waarmee ek op ’n daaglikse basis in die praktyk handel, kon verkry.

**SLEUTELBEGRIPE:** Filosofie van die opvoeding, konseptuele analise, opvoedkundige filantropie, alternatiewe praktyke

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

- Prof van Wyk, for his supervision.
- The lecturers and my fellow students in the Department of Education Policy Studies, for the rigorous and thought-provoking discussions during the structured lectures.
- The many philanthropists who make children's dreams come true through their contributions to education.
- My husband Johan, and my daughters, Mia and Jana, for their unconditional love and support.
- My Heavenly Father, through whom all things are possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Declaration</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Opsomming</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>vi</b>

### CHAPTER 1

#### CONTEXTUALISATION AND CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE STUDY

1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
1.3	RATIONALE OF THE STUDY	3
1.4	CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY	5
1.5	RESEARCH PROCEDURES	6
1.6	INTRODUCTION TO KEY CONCEPTS	7
1.7	CHAPTER ORGANISATION	9
1.8	CHAPTER SUMMARY	9

### CHAPTER 2

#### RESEARCH METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1	INTRODUCTION	10
2.2	PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY	10
2.2.1	What is philosophy	11
2.2.2	What is education	13
2.2.3	What is philosophy of education	16
2.3	RESEARCH METHODS	21
2.3.1	Conceptual analysis	23
2.3.2	Exploring the hidden assumptions	26
2.3.3	Questioning a particular practice or policy	27
2.4	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	28
2.4.1	Interpretive inquiry	30

2.4.2	Critical theory	33
2.5	SUMMARY	35

### **CHAPTER 3**

#### **LITERATURE REVIEW ON EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

3.1	INTRODUCTION	36
3.2	THE PURPOSE OF A LITERATURE REVIEW	36
3.3	WHAT IS PHILANTHROPY	37
3.3.1	Philanthropy: History, Definitions, Gaps and Contradictions	37
3.3.2	What are philanthropic practices	42
3.4	WHAT IS EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT	55
3.4.1	Education	55
3.4.2	History and developments in education in South Africa	56
3.4.3	Educational challenges in post-1994	58
3.5	WHAT IS EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY	60
3.6	SUMMARY	61

### **CHAPTER 4**

#### **ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

4.1	INTRODUCTION	62
4.2	ANALYSIS OF 'ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES'	62
4.3	POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES IN THE LITERATURE OF PHILANTHROPY	63
4.3.1	Traditional philanthropy vs Social Justice Philanthropy	64
4.3.2	Philanthropy for Community vs Philanthropy of Community	69
4.4	TWO PARADIGMS WITHIN THE PHILANTHROPY OF COMMUNITY APPROACH	75
4.4.1	Asset-based approach to development	75
4.4.2	Civic-driven change	75
4.5	CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF CONCEPTS RELATING TO ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES	82
4.6	SUMMARY	85

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	INTRODUCTION	86	
5.2	METHODS AND METHODOLOGY	87	
5.3	MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	88	
5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	91	
5.5	NARRATIVE REFLECTION ON MY STUDY	91	
5.6	LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY	92	
5.7	WHAT MAKES THIS RESEARCH IMPORTANT?		93
5.8	CONCLUSION	94	
	<b>REFERENCES</b>	95	



## **CHAPTER 1**

### **CONTEXTUALISATION AND CONCEPTUALISATION OF THE STUDY**

#### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

Through my involvement in educationally related support programmes I have come to learn of the complexities within the field of education. Since the democratic education system came into operation, it has introduced newly designed policies, systems and practices in order to provide quality and equal education to children in South Africa. Because of the structural inequalities left in the education system (schools and higher education and training institutions) by the former unequal education system, there has been a greater call for public-private partnerships among all stakeholders, including public, private and civil society, to provide support. Among the stakeholders that have the history, aims and means to provide support for education are individuals or organisations providing philanthropic support. In my own experience, support programmes, through philanthropic practices, can either contribute to development in education or add to the current well intentioned, but in some cases misaligned, non-structured external practices of support to schools. In this study I attempt to understand, interpret and critically inquire about what is being understood when thinking about philanthropy, what education is understood to be, and what constitutes educational philanthropy as a concept. Being involved in a self-conceptualised practice of philanthropy, I also wanted to understand what current as well as alternative practices of philanthropic support exist in education. I argue that alternative practices are needed in philanthropy. The purpose of this study was to conduct a philosophical study of alternatives to current practices of educational philanthropy.

#### **1.2 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY**

My interest in the study stems from my current work in education-related projects. My past experience as a social worker, working with children, youth, families and communities on social development initiatives, provided the background for my current knowledge and skills in the development field. My voluntary involvement managing a tertiary bursary programme for an individual philanthropist, and with this tertiary bursary programme also providing leadership and management for school support programmes for a private family philanthropic foundation, afforded me the space to gain knowledge about the fields of education as well as

philanthropy. Fataar (2011:13) explains, “education should be understood as part of broader social change”. Education and development historiography focuses on a number of areas, which include social development. Social development refers to issues relating to and determining quality of life and meeting basic needs. Furthermore, debates about the relationship between education and modernisation are central to this area. Modernisation refers to the socio-psychological processes through which people adopt modern attitudes in order to fit into a changing society. Education therefore is seen as a key instrument in facilitating the adoption of such attitudes. Fataar (2011) also refers to how development thought can be traced to Aristotle in ancient Greece. Aristotle is credited as being the first theorist of the state, and was of the belief that development takes place in cyclical patterns that involve the growth and decay and eventual re-emergence of civilisations. Educational development challenges are complex and require multifaceted, integrated, systematic and holistic collaborative approaches if any changes want to be achieved. Educational development also needs conscious efforts – financial as well as non-financial – between government, non-governmental, civil society, business and private organisations such as philanthropic organisations to work together collaboratively to promote quality education. Christie (2008:24) concurs that education systems involve costs and need to be funded.

My work entails the provision of strategic leadership and management to the project phases of conceptualisation, design, development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, reporting back to the individual philanthropist or family foundation trustees for further decision making or budget allocation. In initiating the education-related projects, I have learned that there are different ways in which education is conceptualised, and these are more commonly reflected in early childhood development, especially Grade R, in preparing preschool-aged children for primary and secondary schooling. The post-matric or tertiary field is articulated as the enrolment of post-matriculants into further education tertiary institutions, which are articulated as artisan skills centres, academies, colleges and universities, or institutions where post-matriculants can receive in-service training and receive a stipend. In other cases, non-profitmaking institutions seeking funding to roll out education-related projects at schools or tertiary institutions are also included in this category. These entities are usually articulated as beneficiaries.

My organisation thus, through its practices in philanthropy, would contribute its financial resources through funding proposals, grants or donations to the outcome of quality education

to all children involved in the above projects, and articulate its involvement as ‘goodwill’, ‘charity’ or ‘philanthropy’. My experience and observations are that these beneficiaries have their own perceptions of what philanthropy entails, which leads to ambivalence in their expectations and what the organisations are contributing. I thus draw the conclusion that there might be different conceptions and understandings of the concepts of education and philanthropy, and therefore I want to analyse the different interpretations and understandings of the concepts. I also have observed that there is a lot of goodwill in civil society, public and private organisations and philanthropic organisations already contributing through current practices and projects that are being rolled out at schools, and thus I wanted to have a broader understanding of the kinds of current practices in philanthropy contributing to education. Being confronted with the complexities in the educational space, and the realisation that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution for these complexities, led me to conclude that the current practices might not be sufficient for these complexities, and I thus wanted a broader understanding of alternative practices of educational philanthropy in order to contribute to meaningful and impactful educational development.

### **1.3 RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY**

Lingard, Nixon and Ranson (2008:3) agree that educational development in South Africa post-1994 is affected by various complex challenges that require collaborative efforts to bring about change in education. They are of the view that education becomes central to future well-being, especially in periods of economic and social transition, and yet the form it should take remains a challenge. In the South African context, it requires government, civil society and private entities to work together if meaningful change is to happen.

Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009), Kuljian (2005), the South African Institute for Advancement (2013), Moyo (2008), Fig (2002) and Mahomed (2008) are all in agreement that philanthropy could be one of the partners for collaborative efforts to facilitate meaningful change in development. The ways in which philanthropy has and still is responding to educational challenges vary and take on different forms, motivations and objectives. My main aim thus was to explore what alternatives exist to current practices of educational philanthropy that can respond to the educational challenges in South Africa in order to bring about meaningful change in education. Philanthropy has taken on different forms and developments over the years and has different meanings, connotations and interpretations for different people.

In this study I analysed the concepts of education and philanthropy and interpret the possible meanings of educational philanthropy.

The challenges and development needs in education (pre-school, primary, secondary schooling and higher education and training) require government, civil society and private organisations to work together if we want to contribute to providing the children and youth of South Africa with the best opportunities. Philanthropy can be one of the collaborative partners in working towards that change. Philanthropic organisations and beneficiaries, however, have their own perceptions of what constitutes philanthropy, and these are focused primarily on the giving of money or resources. My involvement in the educational space has led me to realise that sustainable impact and meaningful change do not only lie in the provision of money/resources, but should be balanced with the emancipatory role they can play. I agree with Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009:xi) that “the poor have the power to sustain a development intervention and its impact (or not)”.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and the Declaration of the Rights of the Child of 1959 established access to free and compulsory education for all as a fundamental human right (Fataar, 2011:9), and the Freedom Chapter adopted in 1955 provided a vision for a future society based on human dignity, democracy, equality and sharing of wealth (Christie, 2008:4).

Christie (2008:2, 3) points out that a highpoint for South Africa was when apartheid came to an end. The mandate of the new democratic government, which took over power in South Africa in 1994, was to transform the country from a racist apartheid state into a modern democracy. Christie (2008) points out that the new government had to build the new democracy, develop the economy and regulate society in line with the values of human dignity, equality and justice. One of the most important tasks was to rebuild the education system, which had left deep inequalities in schooling after forty years of apartheid. The racially divided education departments were brought into provincial departments by the new government, and they developed a system of funding that would make it possible for the poorest provinces and schools to receive more than their wealthier counterparts. The democratic government built more schools and classrooms, and improved the resources in the poorest and most disadvantaged schools. The newly designed system kept operating at the same time as fundamental changes were introduced.

However, several factors hampered the achievement of change. Test scores suggested that the system was not serving all students equally, or even well. Matriculation results told a mixed story of success and failure. Disappointingly, South Africa's performance was affected poorly by poverty and poor functioning of many of the country's schools. It seemed that, for the majority of young people, democracy had not brought better prospects in education. Patterns of inequality in education remained the same, as poverty, race and region marked out different educational experiences for most South African children. Opportunities for higher education, vocational training and employment opportunities for the youth are just some of the areas of concern in education. Educational development is thus regarded as a priority issue. Fataar (2011:11) refers to educational development as the dynamics internal to education, for the development of individuals and systems. Education policy in South Africa drawn up between 1994 and 1997 manifested a very definite vision of educational and social reform. Among the policy documents driving educational development are the Reconstruction and Development Programme base document, the RDP White Paper, the GEAR strategy and the White Paper on Education and Training.

Philanthropic giving can be one of the collaborators in educational development and contributing the necessary support and change. M Porter and M Kramer, in an article published in November 1999 ("Philanthropy's New Agenda: Creating Value") argue that philanthropic foundations can and should lead social progress, because they have the potential to make more effective use of scarce resources than either individual donors or the government. Free from political pressures, foundations can explore new solutions to social problems with an independence that governments can never have. And, compared with individual donors, foundations have the scale, the time horizon and the professional management to create benefits for society more effectively.

#### **1.4 CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE STUDY**

Moyo (2008:3) explains that, although the term "philanthropy" is old, it is differently understood in different parts of the continent. J Gill (2002) shares that philanthropy is almost as old as western civilisation. She refers to Orosz and Josey (2002), who trace the origins of philanthropy back to Plato's Academy. At that time, philanthropy meant a "love of humankind". Today, philanthropy is almost always associated with the giving of money. Moyo

(2008) elaborates how, when you discuss with philanthropist the reason for them giving their money, they say it is indeed “to do good”, “to improve the lot of others less fortunate than themselves or to enrich the lives of other in their community”. I agree with her argument that those involved in philanthropy can give more than just money to a community; they can enrich society as a whole. The way philanthropy thus is carried out becomes important, as it has the potential to build social capital in communities. Long-term investment in areas such as education, health and infrastructure are some of the solutions that Moyo highlights. In my study I tried to look at current practices in educational philanthropy in order to try to find alternatives.

Some understandings is that private family foundations have emerged from families giving private money for public good. As family foundations in philanthropy form part of the broader civil society, they have the potential to act as an essential element in a vibrant democracy, as together with the broader community, they can serve as checks on power, ensure service delivery to communities, and offering alternative and innovative ways of solving problems.

Through this research I wanted to understand and explore:

- How educational philanthropy is articulated in the literature;
- What current practices of educational philanthropy exists;
- How the literature articulates alternative practices of educational philanthropy that can respond to educational challenges;
- What constitutive meanings I can draw from understanding the concept of educational philanthropy.

## **1.5 RESEARCH PROCEDURES**

Waghid (2002:41) explains that education policy research is characterised by ways of thinking and acting expressed through terms such as “inquiry”, “methods”, “techniques”, “methodologies” and other terms.

The research procedures for this study included the research question, research methods and research methodology, which are discussed in the next chapter. I formulated my research question against the backdrop of my current professional background and observations in the field.

## 1.6 INTRODUCTION TO KEY CONCEPTS

The following meanings of concepts relevant to this study occur in the literature and I drew particularly on *Philanthropy Insights: Perspectives from South Africa* (The South African Institute for Advancement, 2013: 58), which provided meanings of concepts used in this study.

Beneficiary: An individual or organisation that benefits from the programmes or is supported by the donor.

I am not in agreement with the term ‘beneficiary’, as it implies that a person/organisation is the only one benefitting from the giving. My experience of how philanthropy can be meaningful is when both the “giver” and the “receiver” are in a mutually beneficial relationship and active participants in the facilitation of that relationship.

Charity: A concept that has emerged through religious belief, which refers to the act of giving money or gifts in kind (e.g. food, blankets, etc.) to the poor in order to meet their immediate needs.

I find this word, together with “poor”, particularly discomfiting/uncomfortable, as it immediately creates a picture of that person/organisation not having any power over his/her/its destiny/situation that brought him/her/it into that position in the first place or not having the power to get out of that situation. I do believe in human agency having power that could, with the right kind of support and respect, be discovered by the person him/herself.

Philanthropic foundation: A formal entity (usually a trust) especially established by an individual to institutionalise his/her philanthropy and to make grants to support a cause/causes of interest to the founder.

I also experience that the nature of a foundation should not be static, but must be open to change and development, depending on the board of trustees’ or leadership’s willingness to evolve.

Donor: A person who makes a donation or who gives to public benefit organisations.

Critical questions need to be asked by donors about their own perceptions, motives and values in their acts of giving.

Grant: A grant is a non-repayable award made to an organisation, institution or individual for a variety of reasons, including projects for the public good, research, bursaries, etc.

The concept “public good” interested me in particular, and I looked at it critically in inquiring about “who/what is the public good?” for whom does it constitute a “public good”? is it always for “public good” or sometimes “public damage”? Does the “public good” regard itself as the “public good”?

Philanthropy: The original meaning was “love for humankind”, but it now refers to strategic, private individual financial donations for the public benefit, often focusing on systemic change.

Depending on who the individuals or organisations are and their own frameworks and understanding of philanthropy, I am not in agreement that philanthropy can be regarded as always strategic and focused on systemic change. There needs to be a conscious strategic goal and effort in order to be the latter.

As a possible contribution to the limited academic work on philanthropy, my study focused on how educational philanthropic organisations conceptualise their role as philanthropic organisations, how they understand the educational challenges and educational development needs in South Africa, and how alternative ways of philanthropy can respond to the current practices of educational philanthropy in order to contribute to meaningful educational change in South Africa.

## **1.7 CHAPTER ORGANISATION**

In Chapter 2 I provide an account of what a philosophical inquiry is, as well as the research methods and methodology I applied in my study.

My aim in Chapter 3 was to start with what constitutes a literature review, look at how the concepts of education and philanthropy are articulated in the literature, and what educational



philanthropy concludes to be, and then give an account of how current practices in educational philanthropy are articulated in the literature.

In Chapter 4 I provide an account of the necessity for investigating alternative practices of educational philanthropy, and then interpret the literature on international and African practices of philanthropy.

Chapter 5 concludes with the findings, conclusions, recommendations for further research in the field and a narrative reflection on my study.

## **1.8 CHAPTER SUMMARY**

In this chapter I briefly outlined the background to educational philanthropy and why the study is of significance. I have provided the procedures used, which include the research question, research method and methodologies, including interpretive and critical inquiries. Key concepts I reflect on in the study were also clarified. More in-depth analysis of the concepts of education and philanthropy, as well as current practices of philanthropy, will follow in Chapter 2.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **RESEARCH METHODS AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

Educational philanthropy is interpreted and understood in various settings and thus is practised differently. In order to understand the practice of educational philanthropy, I embarked on a research study to try to interpret and understand the different concepts and terms used in this study. Scott and Usher (1996:10) regard “addressing and investigating” educational questions, issues and problems something to be found in everyday practice. What distinguishes this research study from everyday investigations is that it is “systemic, rigorous and methodical” in nature. This is thus the ‘scientific mode’ as a general characteristic of research, exploring the research question of alternative practices of educational philanthropy. Scott and Usher (1996:11) say this is a discourse characterised by a universalising thrust and totalising aim and that therefore tends to be intolerant of difference. It thus produces a scientism, which has the most profound consequences for research in the human and social sciences (Scott & Usher, 1996:11).

In this chapter I will explore why a philosophical inquiry is appropriate for conducting this research, and I will look at the philosophy of education, three methods of philosophical inquiry and the methodologies that will be applied throughout my study.

#### **2.2 WHAT IS PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY?**

Since my research is a philosophical inquiry, which was conducted within the philosophy of education, I will briefly explain the purpose thereof. Burbules and Warnick (in Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:31) state that, for educators seeking a sense of meaning and purpose to their work, philosophy can offer various resources. Amongst others it provides conceptual tools to explore and clarify the underlying assumptions of competing value frameworks, and affording skills for critical reflection on conventional views and assessing their worth; furthermore, philosophy affords positive, constructive, alternate frameworks and visions of radically different possibilities that can stretch the imagination and expand the spirit. The question that needs to be answered thus is, what is philosophy of education? I will firstly

explore the concept of “philosophy” and thereafter the idea of “education” in order to answer the question of how “philosophy of education” may be understood.

### **2.2.1 What is philosophy?**

I now briefly will introduce the concept of philosophy. Reid (1962) starts off by stating that the nature and function of philosophy is itself a kind of philosophical problem. Before one would start talking about the “philosophy” of anything, in this case the philosophy of education, one ought to say what philosophy is (Reid, 1962:3). A great need is that people should have a ‘philosophy of life’. It is thus not only the prerogative of a few professionals, but is needed as a guide for ordinary people in their everyday life (Reid, 1962:4). Reid (1962:4) contends that we are living in a bewildered age, where scientific and technical knowledge have increased enormously, “but we have lost our way”. Life hence lacks meaning and purpose, and he thus regards the philosopher as the one person who can tell us how life can have direction and integration. Reid contends that a philosopher should see life steadily and see it whole.

All this can be extended and applied to the philosophy of education, because, as argued by Reid (1996:4), if we are to educate sensibly, we must above all do it with a sense of direction and proportion, which is to have “philosophy”. “Philosophy is love of wisdom, the philosopher is the lover of wisdom, and it is ‘wisdom’ that we need” (Reid, 1962:4). Reid (1962:10) points out that philosophy as it is practised today is very unlike science; it has no strict proofs, no theorems and no questions that can be finally decided “yes” or “no”. He contends that “philosophy is transforming the whole intellectual scene and as a consequence of this, reduces the number of questions which befog and bedevil us”.

Philosophy is always a philosophy of something: the philosophy of art, science, and politics. Philosophy thus has a traditional subject matter (Archambault, 1965:8). It is primarily concerned with problems of epistemology and ethics. Its aims, concerns and manner of investigation distinguish philosophy from other disciplines.

According to Archambault (1965:1), educational theory is concerned with three major kinds of investigation. He describes the three modes of inquiry as scientific study, historical analysis and philosophical inquiry. He furthermore defines the major aim of philosophical inquiry making clear those factors that are susceptible to investigation by the other disciplines, to

explore and explicate the philosophical premises underlying investigations in these other areas, and an attempt to shed light on the issues involved in the complex educational problems.

Archambault (1965:5) describes the notions of the functions of philosophy to make clear the diverse factors that are involved in complex issues of major theoretical import. This involves a strong emphasis on analysis, both logical and linguistic. It further entails a great deal of attention to the elimination of ambiguity, and specifically a treatment of limited, clearly discernible issues, which often are drawn from common experience; hence an emphasis on the analysis of ordinary language, and the treatment of common practical puzzles. The role of philosophy is seen as a much more modest one in that only limited solutions, or perhaps merely clarifications of severely limited solutions, are sought.

The concerns raised by analysts like Reid in Archambault (1965:5), regarding the limitations of analysis and the need for a clearer and stronger role for philosophy in informing vital decisions, are pointed out. There is a fear on the part of many that philosophical speculation has become arid; that it has, in developing a more sophisticated method of study, unwittingly divorced itself from its proper and traditional concerns – an investigation of central problems, including value considerations, which underlie the tragic concerns of life.

Hirst and Peters (1998:28) regard “philosophy” as an activity that is distinguished by its concern with certain types of second-order questions, with questions of a reflective sort that arise when activities like science, painting pictures, worshipping and making moral judgments are going concerns. Second-order questions are those that inquire in a reflective way. The question can also be asked what then distinguishes philosophy from other forms of reflective enquiry, as not all reflective second-order questions are philosophical. One of the important points in philosophical method is to show points by means of examples. Hirst and Peters (1998:28) use the example of supposing that one teacher says to another: “You should not punish children by keeping the whole class in”, and another says “That’s not really punishing them; and how do you know you shouldn’t do this anyway?” The second teacher is then dealing philosophically with the moral judgment made by the first teacher. What then makes this reply philosophical? This reply involves reflection about the “concept” of “punishment” and about the sort of “grounds” that are good grounds for making a judgment of this sort. Philosophy, in brief, thus is concerned with questions about the analysis of concepts and questions about the grounds of knowledge, belief, actions and activities.

Willis (2007:204) states that a reflective model of research assumes that many, if not most, important problems in the social sciences cannot be stated as well-formed issues and solved with preformed solutions. He contends that, in such a situation, the art of problem framing, the art of implementation and the art of improvisation make up reflective practice and reflective research. For Hamm (1998:10, in Van Wyk 2004:9), philosophy is concerned with meaning, with justification and with an examination of assumptions. I will now turn my discussion to the concept of “education” in an attempt to bring me closer to understanding “philosophy of education”.

### **2.2.2 What is education?**

I will provide a brief introduction to the concept of “education”, as I provide a more detailed account of how the concept of “education” is understood differently in different contexts and how it relates to educational philanthropy in the next chapter. Peters (1967:1) states that “education” refers to no particular process, but rather encapsulates criteria to which any one of a family of processes must conform. He regards “education” as both a task and an achievement verb, and talks of all education as being “self-education” (Peters, 1967:2). Winch and Gingell (2008:63) put it that the word “education” may be derived from one of two Latin words. These are “educere”, which means “to lead out” or “to train”, and “educare”, which means “to train” or “to nourish”. They also refer to Richard Peters, a British philosopher of education, who has suggested three complex criteria in analysing the concept of “education”.

The first criterion is that the concept has a necessary implication that something valuable or worthwhile is going on. Peters’ second criterion is that the concept involves the acquisition of a body of knowledge and understanding, which surpasses mere skill, know-how or the collection of information. To this body of knowledge and understanding must be added a “cognitive perspective”, whereby the development of any specialism is seen in the context of the place of this specialism in a coherent pattern of life. Thirdly, the process of education involves at least some understanding of what is being learned and what is required in the learning (Winch & Gingell, 2008:63).

Winch and Gingell (2008:63) elaborate on Peters’ 1996 writings that the world into which those educated are being initiated is one with cognition at its heart, where he sees cognition as having

necessary links to other capacities of mind, e.g. character development and emotions, but also is a public world for the structures of cognition. They showed how Peters tried to answer his first criterion of worthwhileness within this world. As various authors for various reasons critiqued Peters' definition, his position has shifted in that he distinguishes between two analytical concepts. Those of the "thin" analytical concept of education, which involves preparation for life through the learning of something worthwhile, and "thicker" concepts that involve substantive values and orientations towards particular kinds of lives. Winch and Gingell (2008:66) also refer to White (1982), who defines "education" as "upbringing", and Winch (1996), who refers to the concept as "a preparation for adult life".

Barrow and Woods (2006:12) refer to an "educational system" by stating that organisations in education do a number of things and have more purposes than just to educate. According to them, education does not only take part in some part of the system, it may be advanced in all sorts of ways. They refer to the concept as "upbringing" or "acquiring knowledge". The telling aspect of this broad concept of the educational system is that it is value free.

Waghid (2003:13) refers to education as not being a one-way process in which knowledge is being transferred from educator to learner. He highlights that education in relation to intersubjectivity is considered a "co-constructive process". He refers to Taylor (1985), who states that both learners and educators play an active role in which meaning is not transferred, but produced. In this kind of framework, education requires a personal relationship in terms of which learners and educators engage in purposeful social co-operation. Taylor (1985, in Waghid, 2003:13) thus argues that education cannot be a unidirectional process of transferring ready-made outcomes or knowledge constructs to learners. For education, this means that the collective activities of learners and educators constitute the meaning of what is learned. Learners and educators are thus co-partners in the making of the outcome, and the practice of education is thus one of social co-operation, which justifies the claim of education being a social practice. Van Wyk (2004) elaborates on the concept of "transformation" in the criterion of education. He concludes that transformation is inherent in the processes and goals of education, and for education to be deemed a success it has to bring about a "transformation" in the person who is or was "educated". My contribution through this study is thus in terms of educational philanthropy, namely that all actors involved (both donor and beneficiary) might need to transform their understanding, thinking and practise of educational philanthropy in order to make meaningful contributions to education.

Biesta (2009:35) points out that there is an “is-ought” problem in the philosophical literature regarding the direction of education. When being engaged in decision making about the direction of education, we are always and necessarily engaged in value judgments – judgments about what is educationally desirable. We need to evaluate the data and also engage with values. For Biesta (2009:35), the need to engage explicitly with values in our decisions about the direction of education is easily overlooked, particularly in those cases in which the concepts that are used already appear to express values. An example of this can be found in discussions about educational effectiveness. Apart from the fact that it is difficult to make a case for education that is not effective, “effectiveness” is actually a value, according to Biesta (2009:35).

Biesta points out that the problem is that effectiveness is an instrumental value; a value that says something about the quality of processes, and more specifically about their ability to bring about certain outcomes in a secure way. The matter with which Biesta (2009:35) then contends is a matter for which one needs value-based judgments that are not informed by instrumental values, but rather by what one might best call ultimate values, which means values about the aims and purposes of education. In the absence of explicit attention to the aims and ends of education, it is more likely, according to Biesta (2009:37), to rely on a particular “common sense” view of what education is for. He cautions then that what we have to bear in mind is that what appears as “common sense” often serves the interests of some groups (much) better than those of others. The common-sense view thus is constructed mainly in terms of what Biesta (2009:37) refers to as “the qualification function of education”. Whether academic knowledge is indeed of more value than, for example, vocational skills, all depends on the access such knowledge gives to particular positions in society, and, as sociological analysis has abundantly shown, this is exactly how the reproduction of social inequality through education works. Biesta (2009:37) contends that the reasons for the relative absence of attention to questions about educational purpose are not merely external, however. He argues that it also has to do with transformation within the field of education itself, and that this is closely connected to a shift in the vocabulary that is being used to talk about educational processes and practices.

Biesta (2009:37) also shows how there has been a rise in the concept of “learning”, with a subsequent decline in the concept of “education”. He alludes to the “new language of learning” and how it manifests in the redefinition of teaching as the facilitation of learning, and education as the provision of learning opportunities or learning experiences. Whilst the new language of

learning is not the outcome of one particular process or the expression of a single underlying agenda, it can be viewed as the result of a combination of different, partly contradictory trends and developments. He also points to emancipatory possibilities in the new language of learning, which relate to one of the methodologies I will be using for the purpose of this research study, namely critical theory. The three different functions of education, being a) qualification, b) socialisation and c) subjectification, will be explored in more detail in the following chapter, as I would like to support Biesta (2009:41) in his view that, when we engage in discussions about what constitutes good education, we should acknowledge that this is a “composite” question, e.g. that, in order to answer this question, we need to acknowledge the different functions of education and the different potential purposes of education.

I have tried to illuminate multiple meanings of the concept of “education” and also pointed out that the purposes and aims of education can be questioned, that hidden assumptions can be explored and that the purpose of education can have emancipatory possibilities. Within the concept of educational philanthropy, education thus can be viewed from different perspectives with different notions of what desirable educational philanthropy outcomes might be, depending on the history and context in which philanthropy is practised. I now turn my attention to what constitutes “philosophy of education”.

### **2.2.3 What is philosophy of education?**

In trying to understand “philosophy of education”, one needs to understand when, how and why it originated by exploring different historical perspectives. The preface in the book *Philosophers on education: New historical perspectives*, edited by A.O Rorty (1998), states that

[p]hilosophy is implicitly pedagogical ... meant to correct the myopia of the past and the immediate ... to transform the way we think, act and interact. Philosophers have always taken themselves to be the ultimate educators of mankind ... They thought that interpreting the world aright would free us from illusion and direct us to those activities that best suits us. A vital and robust philosophy of education inevitably incorporates virtually the whole of philosophy; and the study of the history of philosophy mandates reflection on its implications for education.



In order to gain a comprehensive history of philosophers' views on the aims and directions of education, I familiarised myself with various philosophers elaborated on by Rorty (1998) in her following demarcation: Theories of knowledge (Descartes, Locke) imply educational reforms; ethical theories (Hume, Rousseau and Kant) are meant to redirect moral education; the practical application of political theories (Hobbes, Mill and Marx), which direct the education of citizens; and metaphysical systems (Leibniz, Spinoza and Hegel) provide models for inquiry and set standards for the education of the enlightened. Some philosophers made their educational programmes a central feature of their philosophy. Rorty (1998) intends to return education to philosophy, and philosophy to education.

Philosophical reflection on education from Plato to Dewey has naturally been directed to the education of rulers, to those who are presumed to preserve and transmit or to redirect and transform the culture of society, its knowledge and its values (Rorty, 1998:1).

Archambault (1965:60) distinguishes between two forms of methods of modern philosophical analysis in investigations of issues in education that have emerged over the past few years. One of these has been contributions to educational philosophy for their major purpose to deal with problems in ethics, epistemology or aesthetics, using educational situations or issues as a context for exploration. The second form that the philosophical analysis of education has taken is the direct attempt to use philosophical techniques to clarify problems in educational theory. Archambault (1965:6) highlights the reasons for major trends over the past years in this direction as stemming from changing conceptions of the proper scope and functions of philosophical analysis. Furthermore, analytic philosophers began to turn to interesting practical problems as a context for the investigation of ethical and epistemological questions, or as a vehicle for developing techniques of analysis.

These tendencies within philosophy itself, together with common concern over education following Sputnik 1, according to Archambault (1965:7), prompted a fresh look at the problems of the philosophy of education, which took two forms. One was the use of techniques of analysis by practising philosophers of education. The second form began metaphilosophically, which consisted of "pure" philosophers turning their attention and techniques to the analysis of educational problems. Archambault (1965:7) points out how Peters, who held the chair in philosophy of education at the University of London, was regarded as a "pure" philosopher and has made remarkable contributions in this area. Since the problems of education offer a rich

field for philosophical analysis, and since education is such a complex, vital and value-laden activity, it would seem that the study of philosophy might be a legitimate, valid and valuable study, especially with the particular focus of my study (Archambault 1965:8).

Archambault (1965:9) also emphasises that the philosophy of education should not, and must not, have as its aim the solution of immediate practical problems. It must, on the other hand, make clear those factors that are relevant to making wise decisions in education. It cannot make them, yet it must keep the real-life context in mind (Archambault, 1965:9).

Power (1982:15) regards each philosophy of education to define its purpose in a different way, and the definition put forth makes a difference in the way each philosophy approaches fundamental educational issues. He characterises the purpose of educational philosophy as being inspirational, analytical, prescriptive and investigative (Power, 1982:5). He provides short definitions of these characterisations as the inspirational purpose being to express utopian ideals for the formal and informal education of human beings; the analytical purpose being to discover and interpret meaning in educational discourse and practice; the prescriptive purpose being to give clear and precise directions for educational practice with a commitment to their implementation; and investigation and inquiry as being to inquire into policies and practices adopted in education with a view to either justification or reconstruction (Power 1982:15).

I will discuss a few dominant discourses on what constitutes philosophy of education based on Chambliss's (2009) recent edited compilations. The four volumes evidently show that philosophy of education is not only alive, but a vibrant subject matter in academic life. One author's reply to what it means for philosophy of education to be philosophical is that it is characterised by applying a set of philosophical beliefs to educational practice. Applying a set of beliefs might be a sufficient condition for work to be philosophical, but it would not be a necessary condition. It led him to point to various ways of analysing questions posed in regard to theoretical and practical matters that aim to assist in understanding and guiding education. Some of the questions require a consideration of matters of ethics and the ways in which schools are organised and practices conducted. He sees the selections as examples of how to think and write philosophically about education – examples that may be emulated, criticised and improved upon.

Another author in Chambliss (2009) refers to the shaping of philosophy of education by philosophical problems and by the practical problems of education. The transdisciplinary character of educational theory means that no single discipline is adequate to address its problems. The author in Chambliss thinks that philosophy appears “to be better equipped than any other discipline to undertake the conceptual and synthetic work necessary to the construction of a trans-disciplinary practical theory”. Chambliss (2009) also describes philosophy of education in terms of the *Bildung* paradigm, whereby education is viewed as a means by which children become properly human by learning to be rational.

Further to the compilations, another author in Chambliss (2009) asserts the editor’s belief that “important and creative work” is being done in philosophy. The editor emphasises the dominance of analytical philosophy of education in the twentieth century as an attempt to bring the field into the context of the linguistic and analytical developments, in other words make it epistemologically foundational. They also acknowledge the criticisms of analytical philosophy of education – the idea that distinctions in ordinary language are capable of dealing with many obscurities in thinking and writing, and its unfriendliness to ethics. They also observe that the increased scholarly attention to issues of gender, sexuality and ethnicity has challenged the claims of analytical philosophy. Wittgenstein (YouTube video: 30 October 2013) confirms in his audiotaped presentation that “to imagine a language is to imagine a form of life”. “It’s what we do and who we are that give meaning to our words.”

Analytic philosophy in philosophy of education can help us clarify meanings and investigate language constructions in order to address the philosophical issues of the educational problems we are grappling with in a particular way. According to Heslep (1996), educators often regard the problems of education as problems of institutions and actions, analytic philosophers view the problems of education as problems of language.

Although there was criticism in the 1970s, Abraham Edel was of the view that analytical philosophers have to be especially cognisant of the valuational and socio-historical components of the contexts that give meaning to the language they are analysing.

Heslep (1996) describes analytic philosophy as seeking to clarify meaning, whether linguistic or conceptual. It focuses upon language as its subject matter or area of inquiry, thereby departing from the many philosophies that have concentrated upon substance, existence,

perception and action. Analytic analysis therefore investigates language in order to address philosophical issues. Two methods of analytic analysis are: Logical analysis, which tries to clarify meanings according to the principles and forms of symbolic logic, and ordinary language analysis, which attempts to explicate meanings according to the uses of terms and the functions of the statements in standard discourse.

Heslep (1996) concludes that the analytic approach to philosophy of education has made several distinct contributions. The approach has shown that the clarification of educational discourse must receive special and concerted attention if theorising is not to be vague and muddled. The approach has yielded a large body of studies on educational language, including theories, as well as terms, statements and concepts. The approach has also resulted in the reconstruction of existing theories and the construction of new ones that have benefited from attention to the detail of meaning.

As Heslep (1996: 18-25) has shown, the body of literature derives much from international perspectives and theories, and as Africans shaped by our country's colonial past, our education system is but one of the spheres that has been influenced hugely. With our various languages and the constructions and meanings of concepts, one also might have to consider an African analytical philosophical approach in analysing and giving meaning to African-specific and indigenous language constructions. As Heslep (1996) points out, different cultures may employ the same words when expressing different concepts, but even when they do, they tend to have something like ordinary uses of their terms.

Waghid (2002:5) highlights the 1900's empiricist tradition of philosophers who asserted the importance of analysis as a philosophical method. By this they meant that concepts or ideas have to be explained by breaking them down into more basic concepts and showing their relationship with other concepts. For the purpose of my study, I will break down the concepts of educational philanthropy as well as try to show their relationship with other concepts.

As I have both a theoretical and practical interest in education, I am in agreement with Van Wyk (2004:12) that philosophers of education can seldom turn to just one branch of philosophy. He contends that educating people suggests developing in them states of mind that are valuable and that involve some degree of knowledge and understanding, which requires the philosopher to go into ethics in order to deal with valuations and into theory of knowledge to gain clarity

about the distinction between concepts such as “knowledge”, “belief” and “understanding” (Van Wyk, 2004:12).

For the purpose of my study I will attempt to elucidate the meaning of educational philanthropy by analysing the logical conditions governing the terms expressed in my study, through the use of philosophy of education as a method of inquiry. By showing and understanding the multiple uses and meanings of concepts such as “education” and “philanthropy”, I will be able to reveal misunderstandings or disagreements in the way different people use the concept and to clarify the text in which the concepts are used (Jacobs, 2012:55). I now will discuss “ways/moves of what philosophers do when they do philosophy”, also known as methods.

### **2.3 RESEARCH METHODS**

In order to answer my research question I will use specific research methods. The research method, as described by Lee Harvey in Van Wyk (2004:29), “refers to the way empirical data is collected and ranges from asking questions, through reading documents, to observation of both controlled and uncontrolled situations”. A method of data collection can be either positivistic, phenomenological or critical (Harvey, 1990:1, in Van Wyk, 2004:29).

Willis (2007:196) regards interpretive and critical philosophies to be included under the term “qualitative inquiry”. It thus means that qualitative research is not based on predetermined methods and detailed hypotheses that will rigidly guide the scholar throughout the study, which means research is not conducted within strict technical guidelines. In their place are general guidelines or family resemblances, and a set of foundational beliefs and many guidelines that are followed (but also sometimes ignored or changed). Willis (2007:199) describes “design” as used in research as referring to the researcher’s plan of how to proceed, and this can be flexible.

In describing the research methods available, and by highlighting the few I will use for my study, I want to illustrate the answer to the question, “what do philosophers do when they do philosophy?” Burbules and Warnick (Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:19) contend that, when philosophers are analysing problems and making arguments, they end up doing things that are quite similar, which can be clustered into the Wittgensteinian sense of “family resemblances”. These philosophical moves, strategies and problem definitions are not uniquely associated with or “owned” by any particular school of thought. Although there is

nothing mechanical about their application, they also can be called “methods”. Some of the methods that will be described are constellations of methods, rather than discrete methods (Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:19).

Snyders (2013:12) refers to method as the approach that you adopt for gathering and analysing data. To describe a method is to state, in broad terms, what kind of approach was used and why, and then to present a detailed description of the procedures followed. The description should give sufficient information to enable another researcher to replicate the study. I now will outline ten philosophical methods as ways of framing philosophical problems in education (Burbules & Warnick, in Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:19).

- Analysing a term or concept, showing its multiple uses and meanings, for the primary purpose of clarification.
- An ideological or a deconstructive critique of a term or concept, identifying internal contradictions or ambiguities in uses of the term and/or a disclosure of partisan effects the term has in popular discourses.
- Exploring the hidden assumptions underlying a particular view or broader school of thought.
- Sympathetically or critically reviewing a specific argument offered elsewhere.
- Questioning a particular educational practice or policy.
- Proposing the ends or purposes education should achieve – either in terms of benefits to the person or to the society, or both.
- Speculating about alternative systems or practices of education, whether utopian or programmatic, which contrast with and challenge conventional educational understandings and practices.
- A “thought experiment” – a method that takes an imaginary situation, analyses it, then gradually modifies one or another element of the situation to determine which features are relevant to changing its pertinent character.
- Exegetical work: a close reading of a philosophical or literary text with an eye more towards explication and understanding of its complex meanings than analysis or critique.
- Synthesising disparate research from philosophy itself or other fields to find meanings and implications for educational theory and practice.

I now briefly will discuss the three methods I used for my study.

### **2.3.1 Conceptual analysis**

The approach of this study is conceptual in nature and I explored conceptual analysis in the context of its philosophical roots, which involves a particular understanding of philosophy of education.

I firstly explored the concept of “analysis” and thereafter the idea of a “concept”. Power (1982:8) views analysis as a way of looking at educational issues and nothing more. He regards educational analysts as embracing the principal commission of clarifying language used to express thought in order to be as accurate as possible about the meaning (or its lack) in connection with anything said about education. Power (1982:145) thus regards analysis as having the aim to clarify language and thought, rather than fashioning new propositions about the nature of the world. Language in the custody of grammar and structural linguistics and logic is the analyst’s main intellectual tool in the search for meaning in what has already been speculated about and is now buried away in the archives of philosophical thought.

Hirst and Peters (1998:30) explain that to analyse is to examine the use of words in order to see what principle or principles govern their use. We uncover this by making the meaning explicit. Historically, philosophers like Socrates attempted to do this by trying out definitions. Hirst and Peters (1998:30) refer to a weak sense when another word can be found that picks out a characteristic that is a logically necessary condition for the applicability of the original word. The strong case for definition is when conditions can be produced that are logically both necessary and sufficient. In other words, if one can say “if and only if characteristics x, y, z are present, then an actual practice is taking place’, then we would have a strong sense of definition. In actual practice, we only have such definitions in artificially constructed symbolic systems, where we lay down tight conditions for the use of words. With words that are employed in a much looser way in ordinary language, we would be hard put ever to find such a tight set of defining characteristics.

Hirst and Peters (1998:30) furthermore explain that, in conceptual analysis, we usually settle for making explicit defining characteristics in the weak sense. In an attempt to make explicit



the rules behind our usage of words, and thus be clearer about our concepts, it is important to distinguish logically necessary conditions from other sorts of conditions that may be present. To understand this difference is to understand the difference between doing philosophy and doing science (Hirst & Peters, 1998:30-31). These authors contend that much of what has been called conceptual analysis seems to consist in looking for logically necessary conditions for the use of a word, and hence to be concerned with “definition” in a loose sense. It has become fashionable in recent times to deny that it is ever possible to produce such definitions. Hirst and Peters (1998) point out that ordinary language is not static; it can be regarded as a form of life and, although we might think we have got a concept pinned down, we are apt to come across a case where we naturally would use the word but where the condition that we have made explicit is not established. With this, Hirst and Peters (1998:31) warn that we might not always be successful, even in our search for logically necessary conditions for the use of a word. They also points to Wittgenstein, who argued in two ways. Firstly, he argued that we must not look for defining characteristics in any simple, stereotyped way with the paradigm of just one type of word before us. Secondly, concepts can only be understood in relation to other concepts. This implies that, if we are attempting an analysis of concepts by examining the meaning of words, we usually proceed by taking cases within their denotation and trying out suggestions about defining characteristics (Hirst & Peters 1998:31). I thus explored what other possible concepts relate to the concepts of educational philanthropy practices in order to provide a clear analysis of what constitutes educational philanthropy.

Van Wyk (2004:3, citing McLaughlin, 2000:445), describes “analysis” as “... the elucidation of the meaning of any concept, idea or unit of thought that we employ in seeking to understand ourselves and our world, by reducing it, breaking it down, into more basic concepts or discovering what the concept denotes”. He contends that analysis in this sense is thus concerned not merely with the meaning of beliefs, but also with justification and truth. “The connective character of analysis is emphasizing how one concept is connected – often in complex and ragged-ended ways – in a web of other concepts with which it is logically related” (McLaughlin, 2000, in Van Wyk, 2004:3). I shall now discuss what constitutes a “concept” in order to understand the concept of “conceptual analysis”.

Van Wyk (2004:6) draws on Hirst and Peters (1998:32), who made two important points. We must not look for defining characteristics in any simple, stereotyped way, with the paradigm of just one type of word before us. The second is that concepts can only be understood in relation



to other concepts. The second point is thus crucial as educational philanthropy needs to be examined in relation to other concepts in order to gain a deeper understanding of their meaning.

Thus, on the question “what is conceptual analysis”, I agree with Van Wyk (2004:8) that it attempts to establish “logically necessary conditions” for the use of a word. Sufficient conditions must exist to make a concept necessary. Conceptual analysis therefore is about establishing (philosophical) meanings of terms and is often linked with justification.

Although there are many dimensions of this method, philosophers do value these multiple meanings in themselves as valuable contributions to knowledge. Apparent misunderstandings or disagreements are often linked to people using the “same” concepts or terms in different ways; by becoming clearer about these varied meanings, it becomes possible to focus better on what actually is in dispute. In other instances, an unexamined concept may mask an underlying confusion or equivocation (Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:20).

In the conceptualisation of what educational philanthropy practice should look like, the challenge lies in the apparent different viewpoints and understandings of what the concepts of “education” and “philanthropy” constitute. It thus is imperative to interpret, analyse and describe both concepts and have a clear understanding of what is meant by the terms in different contexts. It also is necessary, after analysing the individual concepts, to understand the concepts as a coherent term. Mouton (2001:175) agrees with Burbules and Warnick (2004) that conceptual analysis can be regarded as the elaboration of the different dimensions of meaning.

Mouton (2001) contends that the strengths of conceptual analysis lie in that it brings conceptual clarity. Well-structured conceptual analysis makes conceptual categories clear, explicates theoretical linkages and reveals the conceptual implications of different viewpoints. Mouton warns that the limitations of conceptual analysis might be that poor conceptual analysis can lead to conceptual confusion, theoretical ambiguities and fallacious reasoning. The risk in the practice of educational philanthropy therefore might be that poor or insufficient practices are being implemented if there is not sufficient conceptual grasp of the theoretical understandings.

Next I discuss my second philosophical method of inquiry.

### **2.3.2 Exploring the hidden assumptions underlying a particular view or broader school of thought**

It is evident from various literature on “philanthropy” that the philosophical concept has a long history and has developed significantly over the years, hence opening it up for diverse assumptions. The approach of exploring the hidden assumptions thus is not applied only to a single term or concept, but to an entire theory or discursive system that gives the concept significance. Burbules and Warnick (in Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:23) explain that part of the purpose of exploring these hidden premises, assumptions and prejudices is that evaluating an idea, or an entire system of thought, involves evaluating its presuppositions, and also its implications. They contend that a second reason for the importance of examining these hidden premises and assumptions is the appeal of an idea or system of thought, and its persistence over time; its appeal may be indirect, operating through the appeal of hidden or latent ideas that may not be apparent at the surface level of belief. The authors are of the opinion that showing these hidden premises is a kind of diagnosis of popular belief, showing that what we believe, and why we believe it, may have different motivations than those we realise, and moreover that these hidden premises have wider effects than we intend. In my view, the concept of “philanthropy” might have various presuppositions and implications, therefore it is necessary to explore the hidden assumptions of this particular concept.

### **2.3.3 Questioning a particular practice or policy as a method of inquiry**

In conceptualising what the focus of my study would be, a number of questions arose as I contemplated different angles in the starting phases of my research process. Once I had the focus of my study, in this instance looking at educational philanthropy practices, I started asking numerous questions within that focus. For example: “What are the different understandings of educational philanthropy”, “How has it developed in the different contexts over the years”, “Are current practices of educational philanthropy sufficient for the educational challenges?” etc. Power (1998:7) refers to Plato’s dialogues, in which Socrates asked question after question of famous Sophists, “never to be entirely satisfied with their answers”. “He always wanted more. He wanted definitions of justice, truth, temperance and prudence rendered precisely. Socrates wanted thickets of linguistic confusion cleared away and complex ideas clarified so meaning could shine through (Power, 1998)”

Practising educational philanthropy gives rise to many questions in my day-to-day dealings in the education field. Among the questions that arise are: “Are practices of educational philanthropy contributing to an equal and just society?”, “Are current practices of educational philanthropy in line with global and national educational development goals”, “Who’s purpose does educational philanthropy serve?”, “Do practices allow beneficiaries to participate and demonstrate agency or are beneficiaries regarded as passive recipients?” According to Burbules and Warnick (in Department of Education Policy Studies, 2013:24), a good deal of work in the philosophy of education is not concerned so much with discourses, principles and systems, but more with specific policies and practices that define educational business as usual. My argument thus is that, in order to understand, one has to question yourself critically and continuously about your positionality and your understandings of the theory and practices involved.

In the following chapters I will elaborate more on my research question by applying these methods. I now will discuss the research methodologies I used to answer my research question.

## **2.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In the next paragraph I discuss my interrogation of what would be appropriate research methodologies to enable me to answer my research question. Methodology may be viewed as the interface between methodic practice, substantive theory and epistemological underpinnings (Harvey, 1990:1-2, in Van Wyk, 2004:25). Methodology can also be described as a paradigm. Willis (2007:8) describes a paradigm as a comprehensive belief system, worldview or framework that guides research and practice in a field. Waghid (2002:42) states that research methodology became the practice of educational research and defines research methodology according to Kelchtermans and Schratz (1994:245) as “the attempt to describe, explain and change (improve) human behavior in educational contexts”. Waghid quotes Fay (1975:76) in claiming that “constitutive meanings (or rules) underlie social practices in the same that practices underlie actions”. Constitutive meanings thus are thoughts or ways of understanding and seeing the world, also known as paradigms.

Morrow (1995, in Waghid 2002:42) explains a paradigm as a “grammar of thinking”, a “form of discourse”, a “shape of consciousness” or a “form of rationality”. Kuhn (1970:75, in Scott & Usher, 1996:15) describes “paradigm” in two ways.

The entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques shared by members of a given scientific community, and secondly it is an exemplary way of working that functions as a model for what and how to do research, what problems to focus and work on. It is thus frameworks that function as maps or guides for scientific communities, determining important problems or issues for its members to address and defining acceptable theories or explanations, methods and techniques to solve defined problems.

Willis (2007: 22) explains that there are a number of general frameworks in the social sciences for doing research. He describes that the terms “qualitative” and “quantitative” are often used to describe two of these frameworks. These two terms imply that the main difference between the different frameworks is the type of data collected: numbers, or something else, such as interviews or observations. The differences also involve assumptions about and beliefs on several different levels, from philosophical positions about the nature of the world and how humans can better understand the world they live in, to assumptions about the proper relationships between social science research and professional practice. Terms such as “world view” and “paradigm” better capture the nature of the differences between different approaches to social science research. Three of the most popular paradigms or world views in social science, according to Willis (2007:23), are positivism or post-positivism, interpretivism and critical theory.

As will be evident in my study, I agree with Immanuel Kant (Willis, 2007:51) that one could not be objective about subject matter because we come prewired, so to speak, with “categories of understanding” that then influence our perceptions. Willis (2007) furthermore explains how W Dilthey (1883), a German historian and philosopher who helped established the social sciences, argued that “understanding can only occur in context”. He emphasises that true understanding is a holistic rather than atomistic process. Dilthey’s alternative, the idea that the purpose of social science research is to understand (*verstehen* in German) what is studied, is a fundamental tenet of interpretivism. “Understanding” here means understanding of context, both historical and contemporary. A number of movements that followed this tradition in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries were existentialism, phenomenology, Gestalt psychology and constructivism (Willis, 2007:54-55).

For these reasons I used **Interpretive Inquiry** and **Critical Theory** as the main paradigms in my study.

I will provide a brief introduction to what “Educational Theory” constitutes in trying to apply the theories of interpretative inquiry and critical theory to my study. Reid, in Archambault (1965), states that educational theory includes all discussion about the curriculum and content of education, teaching methods of good and bad teaching, specialisation in relation to general education, of structure and administration and law, questions of parent-teacher relations, co-education, and psychological, sociological, and philosophical questions that underlie these. The notion of education theory does not imply that there is any single coherent body of knowledge, or that it is the prerogative of any one person, specialist or generalist; rather, it can be regarded as a social phenomenon. Reid contends that the unity of educational theory comes into being only through the conversation of the different experts who care for education as a common concern. It thus can be viewed as the social products of the meeting of minds (Archambault, 1965:21). It also can be regarded as interdisciplinary thinking. This interdisciplinary thinking can only emerge through real communication between experts in the different parts of the educational field.

I will now elaborate on **interpretive inquiry** as a paradigm guided my study.

#### **2.4.1 Interpretive inquiry**

Interpretive inquiry can be regarded as one of the influential epistemologies in social and educational research and can also be referred to as hermeneutic (Scott & Usher, 1996:18). According to Scott and Usher (1996), it assumes that all human action is meaningful and hence has to be interpreted and understood in the context of social practices. For the purpose of my study, I agree with Scott and Usher (1996:18) that, in order to explain the social world, we need to understand it, to make sense of it, and hence we need to understand the meanings that construct and are constructed by interactive human behaviour. As an educational researcher I am seeking to make sense of the humanly constructed concept of educational philanthropy and do so through interpretive schemes or frameworks.

Scott and Usher (1996:19) also point to Gadamer (1975), who argues that it is impossible to separate oneself as a researcher from the historical and cultural context that defines one’s interpretive framework. Willis (2007:99) points to three movements that support understanding as the purpose for doing research, namely “*verstehen*”, hermeneutics and phenomenology.

I will provide brief outlines of each movement according to Willis (2007:100).

#### **2.4.1.1 Verstehen**

The German word for “understanding”, ‘verstehen’, expresses the idea that understanding the particulars of a situation is an honourable reason for doing research. Willis (2007:100) points to Dilthey, who distinguishes between two types of knowledge: understanding (verstehen) and explanation (erklaring). He furthermore says that finding law-like generalisations is fine for the natural sciences, but it is not a suitable goal for the cultural or social sciences. Dilthey’s (in Willis (2007) belief was also that the topic of study was about lived experience. He draws on T Schwandt (1994:118), who explains the essence of interpretive qualitative research as to “...share the goal of understanding the complex world of lived experience from the point of view of those who live it”. This goal is variously spoken of as an abiding concern for the life world, for the emic point of view (looking at things through the eyes of members of the culture being studied), for understanding meaning for grasping the actor’s definition of a situation. I now will turn my attention to a second movement, phenomenology.

#### **2.4.1.2 Phenomenology**

This concept (which is linked to existentialism) refers to the study of people’s perceptions of the world (as opposed to trying to learn what “really is” in the world). The focus thus is on understanding from the perspective of the person or persons being studied (Willis, 2007:107). Willis (2007) furthermore draws on Alan Woods, a British Marxist philosopher (1998), who pointed out that, for him, the most common feature was extreme subjectivism, reflected in its preferred vocabulary. Woods also contends that phenomenology, and thus existentialism, accept that there are no universals that humans can know without doubt. Phenomenology thus forms part of the basis for justifying that social science research attempts to understand the local context, rather than find universals or laws of human behaviour. Interpretivists thus are anti-foundationists; they believe “there is no particular right or correct path to knowledge, no special method that automatically leads to intellectual progress” (Smith, 1993:120, in Willis, 2007). I now will provide a brief account of the third movement that formed the basis of my study, namely hermeneutics.

### 2.4.1.3 Hermeneutics

Willis (2007:104) describes how the term hermeneutics originally referred to the study of sacred texts, such as the Talmud or Bible. Efforts to get at the meaning included the study of the meaning of terms and phrases from the document in other writings from the same era, the social and political context in which the passage was written, and the way the concepts discussed were used in other parts of the document. Gradually, hermeneutics has expanded beyond that original meaning to include understanding human action in context. Smith (1989, in Willis, 2007:104) concludes that they share two common characteristics:

- The importance of language in understanding. Language makes possible and limits what we can and cannot say.
- The emphasis on context, particularly the historical, context as a frame for understanding. You cannot understand human behaviour and ideas in isolation; they must be understood in context.

Smith (1998:13) further points out that there are at least three current versions of hermeneutics, which can be labelled validation (or objective), critical and philosophical. My study used a combination of critical hermeneutical as well as philosophical hermeneutical stances.

Waghid (2002:46) draws on Fay (1975), who agrees with the former authors that interpretive inquiry has two central issues: the self-understanding of the individual forms the basis of all social interpretation (phenomenological or hermeneutical), and human consciousness is transparent (or that human explanations and interpretations, as they appear, do not conceal any deeper understanding of events). Interpretive inquiry thus believes that analysis involves more than observation. The goal of the analysis is to reach self-understanding of the person's action in the situation, and analysing and understanding his or her reasons for their actions. Education policy research in an interpretive paradigm can be described as "qualitative, characterized by the use of archival knowledge, narrative knowledge or observational knowledge" (Waghid, 2002). According to Kelchtermans and Schratz (1994:244, in Waghid, 2002:47), interpretive inquiry views "the human being as a subject of knowledge principally capable of reflection, (potential) rationality, discursive communication and social interaction". The important characteristic of the hermeneutic circularity of interpretation is thus that it always takes place against a background of assumptions and presuppositions, beliefs and practices, of which the subjects and objects of research are never fully aware and that can never be specified fully



(Scott & Usher 1996:19). Willis (2007:98) contends that interpretivism looks for understanding of a particular context and believes that the interpretation of data gathered is critical to how the context is being understood. The goal of interpretive research is an understanding of a particular situation or context, much more than the discovery of universal laws or rules (Willis, 2007:99). The point thus is that, in order to understand the meaning of educational philanthropy for the purpose of my study, it was necessary to understand how these are immersed in and inseparable from a network of culturally conditioned beliefs and practices, assumptions and presuppositions. In the understanding of current educational philanthropy practices I hopefully will be able to add to the construction of contextual or local knowledge, looking at indigenous alternative educational philanthropy practices.

I now will turn my focus to critical theory.

#### **2.4.2 Critical theory**

The term “critical” refers to the detecting and unmasking of beliefs and practices that limit human freedom, justice and democracy (Scott & Usher, 1996:22). In the use of the concept of philanthropy it can have an underlying aim of empowerment of beneficiaries within their social circumstances. On the other hand, the notion of how the concept of “beneficiary” is understood might, in some circumstances, in my view be interpreted as being a passive recipient of funding/programmes. Being a passive recipient implies that the beneficiaries have no voice, power or resources of their own. My point is that, depending on the context in which it is practiced, educational philanthropy can be either interpreted as empowering or disempowering. The Frankfurt School points to Habermas and other prominent philosophers in the field of critical theory who agree with Scott and Usher (1996:22), Carr (1995:12) and Willis (2004:81), that

Critical research assumes the necessity of critique of the current ideology, seeking to expose dominating or oppressive relationships in society. It illuminates power relationships between individuals and groups of individuals, enabling the researcher and participants to critique commonly-held values and assumptions. It requires the researcher and participants to be willing to become aware of how a false understanding contributes to oppression and resistance (Willis 2004).



Calhoun (1995:14, in Lapperts, 2012:30) states that the name “critical theory” was chosen by the founders of the Frankfurt School in the period between the two world wars to symbolise their attempt to achieve a unity of theory and practice, including a unity of theory with empirical research, embracing a historically grounded awareness of the social, political and cultural problems of the age. As Horkheimer (in Lapperts, 2012) suggests, the theorists concerned wanted to distinguish critical theory from the sort of “traditional theory” that accepted the self-definition of the familiar and that failed to look more deeply at how the categories of our consciousness are shaped and how they, in turn, constitute both the world we see and that which we take to be possible. Rasmussen (2004:3, in Lapperts, 2012:30) contends that consideration should be given to the nature of critical theory. The term bears the stamps of the nascent optimism of the nineteenth century, in terms of which it was held that a critical theory can change society and be used as a tool of reason to transform the world. Rasmussen points out how the change involved is the important factor.

Willis (2007:84) regards critical theory to be focused less on methodology, and more on the reason for doing. Guba (1990, in Willis, 2007:84) synonymously uses the term “ideologically oriented inquiry” because it emphasises the focus on ideology as a guide to research. Smith (1993, in Willis, 2007:85) puts it that the regulative ideal of critical, social and educational inquiry is to integrate theory and practice in a way that makes transparent to people the contradictions and distortions of their social and educational lives, but also inspires them to empower and emancipate themselves. Therefore Willis (2007:85) contends that critical theorists and critical inquirers have embraced the Marxian injunction that the idea is not merely to interpret or to understand the world, but to change it. Waghid (2002:48) agrees that the most important dimension of critical inquiry is the fact that it is driven by emancipatory interest. Its purpose is to contribute to change in people’s understanding of themselves and their practices, and thus to free them from the constraints of society. Critical inquiry strives to engender self-reflective activity in individuals to bring about a clear articulation of arguments in an atmosphere of openness to overcome ideological distortions generated within social relations and institutions. A critical approach to education policy research thus aims to generate critical action in others and gives rise to conditions to replace one, distorted set of practices with another, hopefully less distorted, set of practices, as explained by Waghid (2002, citing Carr & Kemmis, 1986:197).

Waghid (2002:51) draws on Habermas (1987), who was a leading theorist in the field of critical inquiry. For Habermas, self-reflective inquiry is crucial to understanding and practising education policy research. He proceeds from the understanding that critical inquiry ought to be grounded in the notion of an “organization of enlightenment”. This notion has two dimensions: the “ideal pedagogical speech situation” and the reform of institutions. For Habermas, critical inquiry should bring about a decentralisation of administration needs and the freeing of institutions from bureaucratic and technical interests. It should also re-theorise the institutional roles of members whose own technical, egocentric interests outweigh the need for greater openness.

The Habermasian critical inquiry also relates to the organisation of action (Waghid, 2002:51). The idea with this is that communicative interaction between education policy researchers, educators, learners, policy analysts and communities should result in new knowledge, which needs to be “systematically incorporated in the process of change” (Young, 1989, cited by Waghid, 2002:51).

Bohman (2005:139, in Lapperts, 2002:32) states that

Critical thinking is the function neither of the isolated individual nor of a sum-total of individuals. Its subject is rather a definite individual in his real relation to other individuals and groups, in his conflict with a particular class, and finally, in the resultant web of relationships with the social totality and with nature.

Calhoun (1995:28), states that “the critical theory of society is, in its totality, the unfolding of a single existential judgment”. Educational philanthropy wanting to play an emancipatory role in the educational space can thus be interpreted through the lens of critical inquiry.

## **2.5 SUMMARY**

In this chapter I have set out to make sense of and understand what philosophical inquiry, conceptual analysis and philosophy of education constitute in order to question the underlying presuppositions and assumptions in the concepts of educational philanthropy. I have also motivated why I chose three specific methods of philosophical inquiry and how the contributions of interpretive inquiry and critical theory as methodologies were regarded as appropriate research methodologies to use for my study.

In continuing in my next chapters, I contextualise educational philanthropy in South African schools by analysing the concepts of “education” and “philanthropy”, as well as analysing or constructing a synthesised meaning around “educational philanthropy”. I provide an account of my exploration of hidden assumptions underlying the concepts and elevate the relevant questions on the current practices of educational philanthropy in order to propose possible alternative practices.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW ON EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

#### **3.1 INTRODUCTION**

In order to answer my research question of alternative practices in educational philanthropy, my aim in this chapter is to contextualise educational philanthropy in South African schools through a literature review by separately analysing the concepts of “education”, “philanthropy” and “practices”, as well as analysing or constructing a coherent concept of “educational philanthropy”. I will try to find “family resemblances” by looking at concepts relating to the concept of educational philanthropy.

Further to that, I shall give an account of my exploration of hidden assumptions underlying the concepts and elevate the relevant questions on the current practices of educational philanthropy, framing them within in the paradigms of interpretive inquiry and critical theory. I will follow this up in Chapter 4 with propositions of possible alternative educational philanthropic practices, but first I will explain the purpose of a literature review.

#### **3.2 THE PURPOSE OF A LITERATURE REVIEW**

Justus Randolph draws on Boote and Beile (2005:3), stating that a researcher cannot perform significant research without first understanding the literature in the field. For this reason I researched the leading authors on the research topic and extracted data from their literature and previous research done. Randolph states that there are many practical and scientific reasons for conducting a literature review, with one of the practical reasons being that the author should be able to demonstrate knowledge about the field of study, its methods and history. Randolph quotes the Educational Resources Information Centre (1982:85), which defines a literature review as an “information analysis and synthesis, focusing on findings and not simply bibliographic citations, summarizing the substance of a literature and drawing conclusions from it”. The review can also be seen as a ‘legitimate and publishable scholarly document’. The student can also discover who the influential researchers and research groups in the field are. Gall, Borg and Gall (1996, in Randolph), highlight that there also are scientific reasons for

conducting a literature review. It provides a framework for relating new findings to previous findings in the discussion section of the dissertation. It also is impossible to establish how new research advances previous research if the state of the previous research was not established.

I thus start my literature review by exploring meanings of the concept of “philanthropy”.

### **3.3 WHAT IS PHILANTHROPY?**

In my daily practice of educational philanthropy, the concept seems to be differently understood and reflected upon, depending on the different positions from which various people reflect on it. For example, philanthropists themselves steer towards an altruistic paradigm, some from a religious orientation, and some from a real need to “look after their people” or “give back”. For some beneficiaries, being on the receiving end of philanthropy, they expect it from philanthropists “because they are rich” and “can afford to share their resources”. Some beneficiaries would actually reason that compared to philanthropists’ perceived status in the media or the nature of the origin of their resources, “they are not giving enough ... they must give more...” Or that “the apartheid era has benefitted them, they must surely give back”. I therefore will try to analyse the meanings behind the assumptions by examining and analysing the literature to provide a few explanations or paradigms regarding the concepts of “philanthropy”, “education” and “practices”. I start off by looking at different conceptions of “philanthropy”, as articulated by various authors.

#### **3.3.1 Philanthropy: History, definitions, gaps and contradictions**

I read widely on the topic of philanthropy and consulted a few dominant international and local scholars/authors in the field. Although the literature might not be representative of all of them, this background of information might assist us in a general knowledge in this field.

According to Shelagh Gastrow, Director of Inyathelo: The South African Institute for Advancement (2013), a non-profit organisation promoting philanthropy in South Africa, South Africa is rich with thousands of organisations that form part of civil society. These organisations are involved in charitable work and traditionally were funded through faith-based organisations. Thus, over the years, civil society has moved beyond charity and the non-profit community also is involved in many areas of which education forms a part. The nature of these organisations

has also changed, as they also include some level of policy development, advocacy and attempts to move toward systematic change. The massive growth in citizen action thus also has required a shift in philanthropy away from a charitable paradigm towards a more strategic focus on change and impact.

Faure in Citadel (2013), refer to Citadel's recent research that shows that high net-worth individuals in South Africa want to do good, make a difference in society, leave behind a legacy and show their gratitude for the bounty in their lives. This is not always easy to achieve and, in most cases, human passion will override reason, resulting in unplanned and ad hoc giving, which he refers to as charity. Even though this kind of giving is necessary in society, a more structured and planned approach to giving (that Citadel refers to as "philanthropy") is required for sustainable long-term change.

Citadel (2013) describes philanthropy, like any other business venture, as finding solutions to problems through effectively using limited resources to deliver a "return on investment". To achieve this goal, a variety of specialists with the necessary skills, experience and insight are needed to create, leverage and minimise waste. Faure in Citadel (2013) is of the opinion that, for any venture to be successful, it should be dependent on the passion and personal involvement of the philanthropist. I am not in agreement with Faure with regard to the term "philanthropy" being linked automatically with long-term sustainable development, because in my view, philanthropic giving can have a charity or development focus, or both. Correctly facilitated, the development focus will bring about the long-term, systemic and sustainable change.

Gastrow (cited in Citadel, 2013:26) is of the opinion that philanthropy currently is a blurry concept in South Africa. Various methods of philanthropy are rolled into one with charity, such as indigenous community assistance, mutual help, networks and systems of patronage, corporate social investment, international aid and individual giving. However, these all have differences in behaviour, values and methodology. Whilst all of these can be viewed as forms of giving, they are not all necessarily philanthropic, as the latter should involve a level of altruism. Gastrow (cited in Citadel, 2013:26) copies from the thesaurus, which defines altruism as self-sacrifice, humanity, selflessness, unselfishness and philanthropy. For some, this kind of behaviour is counter-intuitive, as it involves assisting people who aren't your family or part of your community, trusting people whom you don't know, and giving your own resources to

those who may or may not use them effectively. Philanthropy therefore can be risky. It is at the same time not only reserved for the rich, but can be done by ordinary South Africans who invest the little that they have in new initiatives to the benefit of their communities.

Most of civil society philanthropic organisations function in a charitable paradigm, with direct charitable giving to the poor that can assist with immediate needs such as food and shelter. The charitable impulse unfortunately is a short-term and immediate one, which leaves organisations and communities with ongoing problems. This does not mean, however, that there is no room for charity in society. Immediate relief in times of crises is important, but this does not provide long-term solutions to social problems (Citadel, 2013:26). Sheila Gastrow also points out that philanthropy is regarded by many as corporate social investment. When approached for support, businesspeople often point to the corporate social investment (CSI) spend of their companies, rather than exploring their own personal wealth and the contribution they could make.

Hammack (2010:1235) describes philanthropy as a complex term that has to do with “voluntarily doing good”, “loving humankind” on a large scale. There are, however, many ideas and disagreements on what constitutes “good”. According to Moyo (2008:1187), the term philanthropy is not generally understood nor is it preferred in Africa – because it is not perceived to be inclusive in its scope and reach. Moyo uses the term cautiously to capture two dimensions of what exists in Africa and what is understood to refer to philanthropy. Many prefer to refer to it as “African philanthropy”, while others refer to it as philanthropy with African features.

Different uses of the term embrace different notions of the doer of good works. Is a ruler who uses the wealth that comes by virtue of his office “philanthropic”? Moyo (2008) explains that “philanthropy” can refer to the acts of those who command very large resources, but it can also refer to the work of humble individuals who, if they join with many others, can accomplish great things. A philanthropist can thus be rich, a high net-worth individual, or a general community member wanting to do good.

For many, the disposition and intent of the doer is an essential element of philanthropy. To be philanthropic may be regarded as to give freely, but the act of giving cannot be complete until someone receives: does the receiver thereby fall under the obligations to the giver? Recent

analysts insist that gifts are always relational, and that those who receive gifts must always give something in exchange.

For many, a central thought is how the philanthropist acquires the means to act. To thus say that someone is philanthropic is to praise that person: we want to praise acts that have good consequences, that are significant and effective, that are done with wealth and power honourably earned or through teaching that is honest and sincere, that flow from appropriate motives, that are in accord with honoured beliefs, and that takes others' preferences into regard. In some contexts, philanthropy is a term applied to those who acquire great wealth in ways that will win them honour or praise under religious or community values that hold themselves superior to the values of the marketplace. Some critics are weary of this line of thought, as they argue that philanthropic gifts are simply another form of market transaction (Mahomed, 2008).

I agree with Waghid (2003:14), who points out that to understand why a concept is being used as it is used, one has to know the historical context that has shaped the general principle of a concept and its relational practices. According to Hammack (2010:1237), recent discussions on philanthropy have emphasised the importance of “effectiveness”, “impact” and “engagement” in recognising the limited wealth even of the largest philanthropies, and hence the importance of a venturing spirit if philanthropy is to accomplish anything more than a ritual gesture of desire to do good.

Hammack (2010) make it clear that efforts to extend philanthropic activity across borders are always difficult and fraught with possibilities for misunderstanding and conflict. At the same time, because philanthropy always involves relationships, those who “receive” philanthropic giving and initiatives are always able to exert their own pressure on the donor. Current studies of philanthropy indicate particular concern for effectiveness, for the relationship between philanthropy (however defined) and civil society, and for the relationship between philanthropy and globalisation.

According to Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1187), the term “philanthropy” is not generally understood nor is it preferred in Africa – because it is not inclusive in its scope and reach. The classical and historical trajectory of philanthropy from the American and European understanding is not fully encompassing of the nature and character of what can be likened to “philanthropy” in Africa. Moyo thus explains that authors in Africa use the term with caution.



Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010) captures two dimensions of what exists in Africa and what is understood to refer to philanthropy. Some would refer to this phenomenon as African philanthropy, while others describe it as philanthropy with African features. Whichever way, this phenomenon of philanthropy takes on two dimensions: indigenous – usually informal, and institutional. The latter includes international philanthropic institutions such as foundations, both traditional and new entrants; local institutions and indigenous mechanisms through which communities assist each other and develop their societies. Moyo regards philanthropy in the African context as an area that is heavily understudied and lacking rigorous research. He also contends that there are very few centres in universities that are dedicated exclusively to philanthropy (Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1187). However, he does refer to foundations that support local and international studies, such as Ford, Mott, Kellogg and Atlantic Philanthropies, including those in South Africa – authors like Everatt and Solanki Friedman *et al*, Habib and Maharaj, Mahomed, Wilkinson-Maposa, Moyo; those from North Africa, such as Daly (2007), and from East Africa, such as Ngondi-Houghton (2004, 2008). More studies thus need to be done to move the discourse away from anecdotes to facts.

Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1188) states that the philanthropic landscape in Africa in general is characterised by what some researchers have called both horizontal and vertical philanthropy. Because the term “philanthropy” is not popular with the people on the continent, and neither is it useful in capturing what exists, the emerging body of literature on philanthropy in Africa prefers to define philanthropy as “help” or “giving”, as extracted from Wilkinson-Maposa *et al*. (2006).

Moyo refers to Wilkinson-Maposa *et al*., who refer to philanthropy in the informal realm as philanthropy of community. In this realm, philanthropy refers to giving by the poor to other poor individuals of the community. More often, this form of philanthropy has both cultural and linguistic expressions, such as cooperatives, rotation and savings clubs, normally called ‘stokvels’, communal collective efforts and burial societies.

In the formal realm, philanthropy takes forms such as private foundations, trusts, corporate foundations, family trusts, community chests and, more recently, community foundations. This institutionalised form of philanthropy is understood as vertical in nature, referring to giving to or helping the poor by the rich, which is what my study is orientated around. As I have pointed

out from my own experiences and observations, this agrees with Moyo's (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1188) view that this is a disempowering presentation of philanthropy, especially for the poor, as it places them under the mercy of the rich philanthropists. This interpretation of philanthropy also takes away the poor's agency and the very fact that the poor are philanthropists in their own right. Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010) points to Everatt and Solanki (2005) and Wilkinson-Maposa *et al.* (2006), who say that research is increasingly showing that giving is not an exclusive domain of the wealthy. In other words, they contend that being philanthropic is part of the daily experiences of Africans, and yet there is little evidence of intersections between horizontal and vertical philanthropy. They point out that, where there is an encounter, institutional philanthropy normally thrives.

Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1188) points to the fact that more often than not, these philanthropic behaviours are motivated by what in Southern Africa is called "Ubuntu" – literally referring to humanity or humaneness. There also are significant numbers of people who give both financially and in kind because of their religion. There also is a group of people who give and help because they think that their philanthropic activities are geared towards tackling poverty and development-related matters. Furthermore, Moyo (in Anheier & Toepler, 2010:1188) points to interesting features of philanthropy in Africa, in that there is a thin line between short-term and long-term philanthropic actions in many societies. Charity is not just charity; it is very much linked to giving that is developmental in orientation.

### **3.3.2 What are philanthropic practices?**

In questioning the different meanings behind the concept of "philanthropy", I am also asking what current acts of philanthropy are in order to understand what alternative practices of philanthropy are needed in order to respond to current educational challenges. The actual application or act of philanthropy is usually demonstrated as philanthropic practices. These practices take on different forms and methodologies, depending on the kind of philanthropic structure/organisation, and they can be hidden behind other assumptions. In my experience of philanthropic practices, different practices can also be implemented within the same organisation.

Having established the types of philanthropic practices, I next will provide a conceptual analysis of these types:

- a) local communal giving mechanisms
- b) other forms of individual giving
- c) corporate social investment
- d) community foundations
- e) other local grant-making organisations, and
- f) international private foundations.

a) Local communal giving mechanisms

An important concept in African culture is that an individual does not exist in isolation, but is human because of the individual's relationship with others. Kuljian (2005) quotes Mbigi's summarisation of the concept when he writes: "Africans have a thing called Ubuntu; it is about the essence of being human. We believe that a person is a person through other persons; that my humanity is caught up, bound up inextricably in yours ... The solitary human being is a contradiction in terms, and therefore you seek work for the common good because your humanity comes into its own in community, in belonging." The principle of "one hand washes the other" is embodied in burial societies and savings clubs, where common savings are accrued for the inevitable costs that a family must bear. In a practice called "ukusisa", a relatively wealthy family in the community loans their cows to a poorer family for food and milk production. In the practice of "ilimo", members of a community work together to assist a family with their harvest or to construct a hut. Other examples of communal savings mechanisms include stockvels. According to Kuljian (2005:14), the term "stockvel" has its roots in the cattle auctions or 'stock fairs' of the English settlers in the Eastern Cape of South Africa in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, where black farmers and labourers began to exchange ideas and pool their money to buy cattle. The concept of a stockvel was transported to the cities when gold was discovered in the mid-1800s and large numbers of African men went to work in the mines. Other historians suggest that stockvels were formed by black women who moved to the cities in the 1920s and 1930s as a means of supplementing their meagre incomes. In this context, stockvels transcended their primary role of circulating money and became a comprehensive support system for members in hardship.

Another form of mutual support is through burial societies. The high costs of a funeral can put enormous strain on a family's finances. Burial societies, another form of joint savings, were developed so that a family could ensure their loved ones a proper funeral. People make monthly

contributions to a burial society and then draw on the funds to cover costs such as transporting the body from the city to the ancestral rural home, and providing food at the funeral for the community. Ukisisa, ilimo, stockvels and burial societies are often referred to when discussing the concept of indigenous philanthropy. Authors like Moyo (2008) have asked if these are indigenous philanthropic social support systems or if they are coping mechanisms associated with attempts at poverty alleviation.

With regard to indigenous forms of educational philanthropy, Kuljian (2005:15) uses the example of if someone sets up a scholarship fund for children he/she does not know, whether it is considered philanthropy. However, if the same person pays the school fees of children within the extended family, it is considered an obligation. It is evident that these types of giving and mutual aid groups serve the needs of the broader community, not only the individual: the two are not mutually exclusive. When exploring how to promote philanthropy, it would be wise to build on these already existing mechanisms. Contacts between these forms of local community giving and larger, more Western forms of philanthropy are limited. Local grant-making organisations, community foundations and others could do more by building on what exists on the ground. Limited research exists on the function and impact of various types of mutual support organisations.

#### b) Forms of individual giving

Moyo (cited in Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010:1189) states that, although not much research has been conducted in Africa on individual giving, there are a considerable amount of resources that come from individuals either to other individuals or to formal institutions. Moyo (cited in Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010:1189) refers to the conclusion drawn in a study done by Everatt and Solanki (2006) that South Africa is a nation of givers. Over half of the people surveyed gave money to charities or other causes, a third gave food or other goods to charities or other causes, while almost a fifth volunteered time for charity or other causes. The study added that slightly less than half of the respondents gave money or goods directly to the poor, while the majority preferred to give to formal structures rather than to individuals. This study further showed that white people were inclined to give money rather than goods and other resources. More importantly, this study showed that poverty is not necessarily a hindrance to giving. Another motivating factor for individual giving pointed out by Moyo (cited in Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010:1189) is the need to tackle poverty. As such, individual giving is not an

exclusive domain of the rich; the poor also give. Because of this realisation, emerging institutions such as community foundations are finding that they also can raise resources from local communities. Moyo (cited in Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010:1189) points out that individuals also give of their time. He points to Everatt and Solanki (2006), who concluded in their study that black people volunteering give two thirds more of their time than individual white volunteers.

Moyo (cited in Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010:1189) contends that Africa could have more individual givers had the tax environment been enabling. He points to the South African Grantmakers Association which found that, in most countries, the tax environment does not provide incentives for voluntary giving in the public interest. If this were to be reformed, it would serve as a step forward in encouraging private individuals to donate part of their estates to philanthropic activities.

Kuljian (2005:16) lists alumni giving, family foundations, prominent black businessmen, online giving and plough-back initiatives as examples of individual giving. Kuljian points to the Social Giving Survey done by the Centre for Civil Society, the Southern African Grantmakers' Association (SAGA) and the National Development Agency, who measured attitudes towards individual giving and individual giving behaviour. The survey confirmed that the bulk of giving goes to religious institutions. Although religious institutions historically have tended to support the charitable needs of the poor, the sick, children and the elderly, it seems unlikely that churches, mosques and temples are addressing structural equity issues. So one can assume that this social giving also does not make meaningful impacts on structural educational equity issues.

According to Kuljian (2005:17), in relation to alumni giving it seems as if universities in South Africa do not appear to benefit as much from alumni giving as they do in the United States. A survey conducted by the University of Cape Town indicated that their alumni have a preference for charitable and religious causes, rather than supporting large institutions such as universities, libraries and museums. They perceive support of such institutions to be the responsibility of government rather than individuals.

### c) Family foundations

Kuljian (2005:18) cites Hylton Applebaum, the Executive Trustee for the Donald Gordon Foundation, who suggested that individual philanthropy in South Africa is “an endangered species”. The two major reasons are that there are no tax incentives to promote giving as there are in the United States, and he regards South African society as “racially, linguistically, culturally and politically divided”. Applebaum’s comments are focused primarily on philanthropy from within a group of wealthy white South Africans. While some of them may have thrived in the past, the numbers are shrinking and only a few of them have established family or private foundations. While the numbers of family trusts are growing, they generally do not disclose the grants they make and prefer to work in isolation. More literature on family foundations can be drawn from the 2005 Ford and Mott Foundation SAGA Report.

### d) Prominent black businessmen

In addition to a few private family foundations, several black South African businessmen have joined the Global Philanthropist Circle, an initiative of the New York-based Synergos Institute. Mr Tokyo Sexwale, a member of the Global Philanthropist Circle who set up the Mvela Trust, was quoted in the Sunday Times of 5 March 2005 as saying:

Black economic empowerment is about philanthropy. As my mother says “you have one pair of legs, my son, you can’t take this money with you”. In the end you are going to leave it behind. So philanthropy is what we do, almost every day. We do so without claiming victories. We give money to schools. We provide university fees....both in South Africa and in neighboring countries.

Another prominent wealthy individual, Cyril Ramaphosa, stated that his corporate group launched the Shanduka Foundation, through which they have committed a large amount of money in projects relating to education, training and small business development. For Kuljian (2005:19) it still is not clear whether these two individuals might put some of their personal wealth towards strategic giving programmes. Kuljian (2005) says research on corporate and individual giving within Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) companies and leadership would be valuable. She is of the opinion that high net-worth individuals who have been helped by BEE could in turn take a more proactive approach to individual giving, one that would go beyond charity and handouts. They could act as role models to establish family foundations

with strategic programmes to address clear needs for greater equity. They could explore additional ways to bring the majority of the population into the economic mainstream.

Kuljian (2005:19) concludes that what is known about individual giving suggests that the numerous current efforts are generally neither coordinated nor focused on the root causes of inequity. With a few exceptions, family foundations, online giving and other forms of individual giving go to charitable and religious causes. The challenge is how such giving can be targeted to support those who are most marginalised and to give the poor a voice in policy development and reform. Kuljian (2005) is of the opinion that, if all this power and individual influence were united around the needs of the poor and the unemployed, it could have a significant impact.

#### e) The plough-back initiative

According to Kuljian (2005) this initiative was based on a group of black professionals, originally from the Eastern Cape, who began to “plough back” to their home villages in rural areas with financial, networking and programme support. The Kellogg Foundation also made funds available to establish a national coordinating office in Pretoria to expand the concept nationwide, but unfortunately it has not gotten off the ground successfully. Documenting and disseminating this example and its impact could inform other, similar efforts.

#### f) Corporate social investment

According to Kuljian (2005:20), corporate giving is one of the largest sources of funding for civil society in South Africa. Kuljian (2005) refers to the report titled “The Size and Scope of the Non-profit Sector in South Africa”, which states that private sector funding accounts for 25% of all non-profit income in South Africa, compared to an average of 11% in 28 other countries in the study. Despite the fact that they provide significant support, companies remain reluctant to work with the most marginalised, promote their voice and support advocacy campaigns.

Kuljian (2005:20) stipulates that, as of 2003/2004, corporate social investment in South Africa, funds have gone predominantly to education and training (46%) and health and social development (24%), with the remainder going to a combination of job creation, sports,



environment, arts and culture, safety and security and housing (in descending order of size of contribution). A 6.8% increase over 2002, up from R980 million in 1987 to R2.35 billion in CSI expenditure in 2003, was tracked. Although it appears to be a massive increase, if one adjusts for inflation it has actually remained fairly constant and only an 8% increase in real terms since 1987.

Kuljian (2005:20) points out that it was apartheid and the consequent threat of social unrest to the economy that provided the first real stimulus for corporate social investment. After the 1976 uprisings in Soweto, several companies banded together to establish the Urban Foundation, which focused on urban development, housing and education in black townships. At about the same time the Sullivan Principles were introduced, requiring American companies to justify their presence in the country by contributing to local communities. This encouraged more formalised giving by the private sector in general. In 1984/1985, the groundswell of opposition to apartheid and the international attention it brought provided a further stimulus to corporate giving. Also in the 1980s, and in response to the country's economic and cultural isolation, the South African apartheid government offered generous tax incentives to business to sponsor South African sports. Other corporate efforts were the Joint Education Trust (Jet), formed in 1992, and the Business Trust, formed in 1999, which similarly focused more on service delivery than on attacking root causes. A comprehensive impact evaluation of the Business Trust would be useful in exploring the benefits of this pattern of pooling funds and to determine what impacts were made. Not much CSI giving has paid much attention to rural areas and the needs of women.

Kuljian (2005:21) highlights five major reasons why CSI does not focus on those who are most marginalised, namely that most companies are urban-based and provincially skewed. Gauteng, the most populous province and the economic engine of the country, thus receives more, while the six more rural provinces lose out. Secondly, 15% of the CSI programmes go to company employees and their families, and another 49% to the communities in which the companies are operating. The result is that the people and communities who have little or no connection to corporate South Africa are badly underserved. With the unemployment rate at over 40%, CSI is not reaching those who are most marginalised and have the least access to resources and information.

A third reason for CSI not focusing on the marginalised, according to Kuljian (2005:22), is that the new government is promoting the concept of public-private partnerships to address social



needs and implement government programmes. Companies are encouraged to partner in order to achieve greater exposure and win government favour. It thus is unlikely that companies will publicly criticise government policy or support local communities and organisations that do so.

Fourthly, in contrast to practice in the UK and the USA, most South African CSI budgets (61%) are not determined by a formula. As a result, budgets are more vulnerable to the arbitrary decisions of management and less likely to be strategically focused. Companies tend to focus on inputs and anecdotal evidence, with not much effort to assess developmental impact, lessons learned and implications for policy reform or advocacy.

There also is the contention that CSI needs to be complemented by broader corporate accountability in terms of workplace conditions, the approach to the environment and sustainable development (Kuljian, 2005:22). Building on the United Nations Global Compact and the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), the authors encourage a “triple bottom line” that tracks both the company’s financial as well as the social and environmental impact. Kagiso Trust and Ditikeni Investment Company are examples of successful non-profit organisations exploring asset-building models. A growing number of companies in South Africa have also instituted workplace giving programmes for their employees as CSI initiatives.

South Africa has a vibrant corporate presence, but again, according to Moyo (2008: 1190), information regarding corporate philanthropy is scarce. The few studies that exist show that corporate philanthropy and corporate social investment play a significant role in supporting the non-profit sector. Moyo (2010) points to a study done by Swilling and Russell, which found that private sector funding accounts for a quarter of all non-profit income in South Africa, and a number of corporations have also made contributions through community foundations and through community chests.

According to Moyo (2008: 1190), the question of corporate social responsibility or investment was first raised in South Africa in 1972 by Meyer Feldberg, a professor at the University of Cape Town. He argued that companies in South Africa needed to model themselves on what their counterparts did in the United States by getting involved in the communities where they sold their products and where their employees lived. Consequently, the Anglo American and De Beers Chairman’s Fund were established in 1973. The Urban Foundation was created in 1976 to respond to urban development issues across the country. As there was no public demand

for corporate social investment at the time, such programmes used to be ad hoc. Corporate social investment got a new meaning in South Africa in 1977, with the establishment of the Sullivan Principles, which required US companies to disclose their social investments or close down their operations. This meant that companies had to develop CSI programmes in a more proactive manner than before. As a result, many South African companies formed charitable foundations or trusts in the 1980s, many of which supported institutions of tertiary education. Examples are the Liberty Life Foundation, which invested R100 million in an Educare initiative in 1990, and similarly, in 1991, the Joint Education Trust addressing the upgrading of the quality of teachers, advancing literacy and numeracy among adults and improving educational and job prospects for young people (Alperson, 1995:6, in Moyo, 2010:1191). Philanthropy in the educational field has grown significantly and places emphasis on early childhood development programmes, primary and secondary school learners' support in Maths, Science and Technology, Whole School Development programmes, high school learners' career guidance, and tertiary bursary support programmes and work readiness programmes.

In the years post-apartheid, the CSI programmes of most companies became increasingly visible as they proved their democratic credentials in the new South Africa. Moyo (2010:1191) concludes that corporate philanthropy in the South African context has involved channelling large sums of money to the non-profit sector, but it has not played a role that can be said to be transformational when it comes to changing the structural relations of power or addressing the root causes of poverty. Corporate philanthropy's support of community foundations, for example, arguably has contributed to them side-lining the very communities in whose name they exist. In the same way, Kuljian (2005:20) has argued that the majority of companies remain reluctant to work with the marginalised in order to promote their voices and support advocacy campaigns.

I am in agreement with Moyo (2010:1191) that Africa still needs more research and studies to track philanthropic flows and assess their impact on the development and transformation of societal structures. More importantly will be the alignment of corporate philanthropy with national priorities, as well as with the activities and processes of traditional philanthropy. New studies allude to the focus on diaspora philanthropy, the focus on indigenous philanthropy, as well as optimising institutional philanthropy, which will be useful in defining the philanthropic terrain in Africa in the next five to 10 years. Currently, philanthropy in Africa is still under-

researched, but with more philanthropic institutions emerging and more research being conducted on the continent, the philanthropic map is slowly being drawn.

Given the specific challenges experienced in the educational field in South Africa, it is especially necessary to question to what extent philanthropy in all its modalities contributes to empowering the marginalised, promoting the voice to the voiceless and addressing the root causes of the structural inequalities contributing to various educational challenges. Philanthropy practices thus are urged to rethink and re-conceptualise how philanthropic practices are understood and respond to development challenges.

#### g) Community foundations

Kuljian (2005:24) describes how the Ford, Mott and Kellogg Foundations began in the early 1990s to explore the potential for community foundations in South Africa. A report completed by the Foundation for Contemporary Research (FCR) in 1995, on the applicability of the community foundation model, suggested that the concept could be viable and was worthy of further investigation. In 1996 the Southern African Grantmakers' Association (SAGA) was formed and held a workshop on community foundations and, in late 1997, launched a five-year pilot programme to test the feasibility of the community foundation concept in South Africa. From 1998 to 2002, SAGA worked closely with ten communities. Several of the community foundations in small towns and rural areas failed, and the foundations in the larger metropolitan areas, which showed promising starts, faltered as well. The five-year programme was brought to a close in 2003 and SAGA decided that, rather than focusing on community foundation exclusively, to develop a programme working more broadly with other non-corporate members, including family foundations, local South African grant-making organisations, and other community-based giving programmes.

Kuljian (2005:26) contends that the role of community foundations in addressing the need for greater equity is a concern in the US as well as in South Africa. He quotes Emmett Carson, President and CEO of the Minneapolis Community Foundation, who stated at a conference in May 2002: "Community foundations have not always modelled the best practices of diversity and have not always been at the forefront of championing dialogue and action on the most difficult social issues facing the community" (Kuljian, 2005). While South Africans interested in the community foundation model initially may have been interested in how best to address

development needs and inequity in South Africa, they ended up focusing predominantly on building an endowment and raising assets. Kuljian (2005:26) points out that it is important to remember that community foundations are one possible vehicle to promote institutional philanthropy, not the universal model of institutional/organised philanthropy.

h) Other local grant-making organisations

Kuljian (2005:26) elaborates on South Africa, which, unlike many other countries, has a history of development funding that flowed to a set of indigenous organisations, as opposed to international NGOs. This history helped to build a set of local South African development funding organisations that continue to operate today, such as the Kagiso Trust and the Social Change Assistance Trust. The divestment campaign in the 1980s was another aberration of South African history that resulted in the development of local grant-making organisations. Organisations with endowed funds that were created at that time include the Equal Opportunity Foundation (created by Coca Cola) in Cape Town, the Pretoria Development Trust, and the Trust for Educational Advancement (established by the Ford Motor Company), the Algoa Bay Charitable Trust (also a Ford Motor Company initiative) and the Zenex Foundation established by Xerox Corporation. Although these organisations still exist (with Zenex as the most prominent and active of the four), they have remained limited in their objectives, scope and public profile. Kuljian (2005:26) contends that despite good intentions, none of these organisations has gone on to make a major contribution toward equity issues in South Africa.

The literature still shows limited evidence of local grant-making organisations investing philanthropic giving in educational development. I also am of the opinion that it would be useful to explore what factors affect whether such local grant makers focus on structural change to promote equity or not. Despite the paucity of current research, it appears that these grant makers have greater potential to address equity issues than corporate or individual giving, because theoretically they are considered to be more in touch with grassroots needs, many of them fund community-based organisations, they have a more direct relationship with marginalised communities and therefore a greater ability to encourage community mobilisation and advocacy initiatives.

i) International private foundations

Kuljian (2005:30) points to the US private foundations, which have a long history of working in South Africa. An early example is the Carnegie Corporation of New York supporting the Carnegie Commission on the Poor White Problem in the 1930s. Research has found that, while several foundations focused on community-level programmes, many “put considerable emphasis on policy analysis and the generation of new policy options in education, health, environmental protection, and other major development sectors”. The researchers point out that education was classified, amongst others, as one of the five top priority fields. Comprehensive data on sources of international private giving to South Africa is not readily available. The authors of the Non-profit Study linked to Johns Hopkins contend that the US-based foundations are the largest funders of South African NPO. Kuljian (2005:30) agrees that the latter might have been influenced by the fact that many bilateral donors shifted their funds from NGOs to government after 1994, and that private foundations continued to fund civil society. There are indications that it has been the smaller, community-based organisations that have lost funding as a result of shifts in donor funding trends. Kuljian (2005:30) highlights Caroline Kihato’s research findings from the Centre for Policy Studies that show that “visible, urban-based formal NGO’s with reasonable administrative, research and delivery capacity are more likely to receive donor aid. By contrast, informal, less visible, grass-roots organizations located primarily in rural and peri-urban areas are less likely to do so”.

Kuljian (2005:31) concludes that, although philanthropy is an important aspect of a democratic and equitable society, it is not sufficient to ensure it. She points out that poverty and unemployment, as well as other forms of inequity like education, could continue as a reality for generations to come, especially given the pace at which these issues are being addressed. The beneficiaries of South Africa’s strong economy need to move more quickly to implement strategies that address South Africa’s poverty. Traditional philanthropy is not sustainable and not worth replication, in that it has developed as the way that wealth accumulation by a small proportion of the population is used to address unmet basic needs for those who are lucky enough to be the beneficiaries.

According to Moyo (2010:1189), the foundations active in South Africa were mainly those of international nature, primarily American until recently. There has been an emergence of African foundations right across the continent, such as TrustAfrica, the African Women Development Fund, Mo Ibrahim, Nelson Mandela, Dakota, Solomon Muna and Youssou N’Dour, among many other foundations. Some of these foundations have been created and supported by

international foundations such as the Ford Foundation. Others have been formed by former heads of state, and others, like the Mo Ibrahim and the Dakota Foundation, were created by rich Africans who made their money mostly from the private sector and are now giving back to communities. Moyo (2010:1189) points out that foundations are the biggest constituents of institutional philanthropy in Africa. There also is a growing development of family trusts, about which very little is known.

In South Africa, according to Moyo (2010), in 2002 alone there were 3 891 non-profit organisations that were registered as trusts or foundations, representing 4% of the non-profit sector overall. For a subsector about which relatively little information exists, the number of trusts and foundations would appear to be quite high. Research conducted into a sample of family foundations in South Africa showed that they all were very diverse in terms of the projects that they supported and their overall modes of operation (Moyo, 2010:1190).

Although foundations appear to work in many different areas, the majority work in education, welfare and health. Equally very few family foundations are in areas that could be described as transformative, such as social justice, democracy, rule of law, gender and civil rights, etc., and much of their work would seem to focus on ameliorating the effects of poverty, for example, rather than addressing its causes.

Moyo points to Chen (2002), who states that the tendency towards “charity” among family foundations is not only true of family foundations in South Africa, but is a common feature of much institutional philanthropy across the world. Moyo (2008: 1190), found that most family foundations he surveyed worked with grassroots communities, often giving in kind or running their own programmes, rather than making grants to local organisations to administer projects themselves.

The last ten years have seen an increasing interest and growth in the number of community foundations, as the only two in South Africa in 1998 grew to more than 15 such institutions in Africa, according to the Global Status Report written in 2008 according to Moyo (2010). However, despite the interest and growth in community foundations, a number of challenges still abound in relation to the community foundation concept (Moyo, 2010:1190). Moyo points to the fact that the understanding of the term “community”, which if not properly defined might lead to exclusion rather than inclusion, poses the real challenge. Further to this, an added

challenge has been that community foundations have tended to bypass their communities and depended mainly on international sources of funding. The exclusive focus on building endowments within community foundations has also proved to be a huge task, especially given the immediate needs on the ground and the desire to save for the future. The current global financial meltdown has challenged community foundations to think creatively around investments, making endowment building no longer the most ideal (Moyo, 2010:1190).

Another challenge, according to Moyo (2010:1190), is the fact that both private and community foundations generally do not have formalised working and cooperative relations with states. More often, foundations work independently of the state and its national programme of action. Normally, foundations operate with and through civil society to fill the gaps created by the state's lack of capacity to deliver services to the people. It thus is imperative to encourage a working relationship between philanthropy and the state.

Although I have elaborated meanings of “education” in Chapter 2, I will now turn my focus to the historical context of education and how it has developed in South Africa over the past years, how the developments have necessitated the need for civil support, and how that is understood in different ways. This will contribute to my attempt to gain a better understanding of what educational philanthropy is.

### **3.4 WHAT IS EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT?**

I will now elaborate on what education is in the South African context.

#### **3.4.1 Education**

In Chapter 1 I outlined a few definitions of what education constitutes, and in Chapter 2 I illuminated various meanings of the concept of “education”. Depending from which position people talk about education, and the contribution that education makes in their environment, they will adopt different understandings of the aims of education. In my view, too much of an emphasis is placed on the cognitive development of children (“performativity”), and not much attention is given to the role education can play in contributing to the holistic development of children according to their own potential and so bring about social change. Especially in the context of poor and rural communities, where children's chances of performing cognitively



well due to the phenomenon of foetal alcohol syndrome, uninvolved parents due to various reasons, learners with learning difficulties and many more complex factors, education cannot only be interpreted in terms of academic performance and curriculum results. A much broader definition of education thus is needed for the South African contexts.

For the purpose of this chapter I will seek to understand the concept of educational philanthropy by trying to unpack the historical context of and current developments in education in South Africa.

### **3.4.2 History of and developments in education in South Africa**

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and the Declaration of the Rights of the Child of 1959 established access to free and compulsory education for all as a fundamental human right (Fataar, 2011:9), and the Freedom Chapter adopted in 1955 provided a vision for a future society based on human dignity, democracy, equality and sharing of wealth (Christie, 2008:4).

I draw extensively from current literature by Kuljian (2005), who provides a background on the historical developments in South Africa. While the democratic elections of 1994 gave all South African citizens the right to vote, they did not wipe away apartheid's legacy of widespread poverty and inequality. Inequality was promoted by state policies on education, amongst others. Kuljian elaborates on how the African National Congress (ANC) came into power in 1994 promoting the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), which called for extensive spending on health, education, housing and basic services, with a central focus on the non-governmental sector. In March 1996 the RDP office was closed and the Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) strategy was introduced. South Africa's democratic government came into power at a time when there was a global trend toward reducing the role of the state. GEAR's reliance on direct foreign investment and the private sector did not result in the rapid growth hoped for by government. Specific approaches to poverty eradication also were debated. There was a growing consensus that unbridled free-market capitalism was not able to promote an equitable society. It was agreed that both the state and global capital had to be monitored and regulated. Consensual partnerships among government, the private sector and civil society, often with philanthropic support, can play an important role in finding solutions and identifying alternatives (Kuljian, 2005:8).



According to the Nonprofit Study (Moyo 2010), the non-profit sector in South Africa receives the bulk of its funding from government (42%, or R5.2 billion) and a significant portion from self-generated income (34%, or R4.6 billion). The remaining 25% comes from what the authors term “philanthropy”, which includes South Africa’s private sector (R2 to 3 billion) and the international private sector, including private foundations (R500 million). In “Foundations and the State” (2002), Steven Burkeman explored the possibilities for a contract between endowed foundations and the state. He suggests that foundations take on long-term tasks because election-conscious governments tend to focus on short-term political imperatives. He also suggests that foundations fund more risky programmes because governments tend to be risk averse. Burkeman made a third point: endowed foundations, being somewhat immune to populism, can fund the protection of minorities.

There are relatively few endowed foundations and trusts in South Africa. Philanthropy arises from other sources (corporations, individuals, communal mechanisms, etc.), and the concept of endowments is still in its infancy. Burkemans’s view is that philanthropic resources should address longer term, more intractable and riskier issues. He also concludes that philanthropy could be used to further explore the role of the state in achieving greater equality. The state can promote foundations and philanthropy by offering tax privileges. Campaigns throughout the 1990s sought to broaden tax exemption for non-profit organisations and expand tax incentives for giving. Changes proposed by the Minister of Finance in 2000 resulted in an intense period of consultation with the non-profit sector and negotiations with the South African Revenue Services (SARS). The new law came into effect in July 2001. The old law provided tax exemption to a very narrow set of organisations, defined as religious, charitable and educational. “Charitable” was defined as soup kitchens and welfare work, and did not include job creation projects or other developmental projects (Non-Profit Study Report as cited by Moyo, 2010).

Kuljian (2005:13) agrees that enormous wealth in South Africa is in private hands. Instead of letting the money pass onto the next generations, who will inherit their parents’ wealth, or taxing them so heavily that they try to hide their assets, it would be beneficial to structure estate taxes in a way that would encourage the wealthy to put some of their assets to work as philanthropic, development capital.

Philanthropy in South Africa has been shaped over time by political pressures and the shifting social context. The roots of philanthropy are multi-layered and vary according to different cultural traditions.

### **3.4.3 Educational challenges post-1994**

I would also like to question what challenges exist in education. Van Wyk (2006: 177) quotes Farrel (1999) and Poon and Wong's (2008) model of educational equality/inequality. According to them there are four stages of equality/inequality throughput from a student's schooling stage to adult life stage, i.e. equality of access, equality of survival, equality of output and equality of outcome.

- Equality of access refers to the probability of children from social groupings getting into the educational system. Equality of access is secured by education policies in South Africa and access to education cannot be denied.
- Equality of survival refers to the probability of children from different social groups staying in the school system. Van Wyk (2006) argues that dropout rates in schools and universities indicate that there is not yet equality of survival in the South African system, and he therefore concludes that this issue has not been addressed sufficiently.
- Equality of output refers to the probability that children from different social groupings will learn the same things on the same levels at different points in the schooling system. Van Wyk (2006:177) contends that, despite moves to streamline curricula, there still is no equality of output in the South African education system, as many factors are still working against equality of output.
- Equality of outcome refers to the probability that children from different social groupings will live relatively similar lives subsequent to and as a result of schooling. For Van Wyk (2006:177), the skewed unemployment rates, unequal incomes and unequal access to sites of political power in South Africa make equality of outcomes a distant reality.

Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009:1) draw on Claude Ake (1988), a respected African scholar who questioned why poverty still persisted despite all the money that had been invested by so many large international donors. For example, why is 80% of the world still living in

poverty and why are people suffering more instead of making progress? Ake (1988) continues and state that the widespread poverty, despite donations and aid, has led some to deduce that poor people are somehow hijacking their own development.

Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler's (2009:2) research found that the organic helping system, was found in poor African communities in the depth and complexity of the resilience with which communities have coped, survived and even advanced under adverse circumstances. Ake's research (1988) in confirms that sustainability lies in embedding support in the everyday lives of ordinary people. Since Ake's writings on community grant-making organisations, these organisations have acknowledged indigenous practices and, in some cases, even built on them. However, many continue to fall short of their promise of assisting community development. This is because major agencies have been unable to alter their own practices in such a way that they give real effect to the philosophy of building from the local and the indigenous. Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) stress how philanthropy models often rests on weak foundations and untested assumptions when applied in an African context. They agree what Ake (1988) remarked that this conceptions are expensive errors with serious implications: firstly, that the philanthropic field may be overlooking a major opportunity to make the provision of aid more effective and sustainable and, secondly, that these indigenous systems run the risk of being weakened or eroded by efforts of aid organisations that are applied without an understanding of the systems already in place.

The outlined historical context and recent developments in South Africa highlight a number of positive developments, but also concerning challenges, in education. In the next section I look at how philanthropy can make a positive contribution to addressing some of these educational challenges through educational philanthropy. As this concept is not found in the current literature, I will try to construct such a concept based on my own understanding thereof.

### **3.5 WHAT IS EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY?**

In order to answer my research question in relation to what alternatives exist to current practices of educational philanthropy, I have explored the concepts of "philanthropy" and "education" in the preceding section. I now proceed to the construction of a synthesised concept of "educational philanthropy". It needs to be mentioned that I did not come across this concept in the literature on philanthropy or education. I found Van Wyk's (2009) book chapter on

“University as organization or institution: A cultural debate and one institution” helpful in terms of how he aimed to synthesise the concept of “institutional culture”.

As philanthropy’s underlying understanding is about “help, giving or charity”, a very simplistic understanding of educational philanthropy would be “help, giving or charity in education”, or “help, giving or charity to education” for the purpose of educational aims, whatever those aims are understood to be for the different environments.

Current practices of educational philanthropy (charity/help/giving) include efforts in support programmes on the levels of, amongst others, early childhood development programmes, subject-specific learner enrichment support for primary and secondary school learners, especially in Science, Technology, Economics and Mathematics (STEM subjects), enrichment programmes for school leadership and teacher development, as well as career guidance and work readiness support for high school learners and tertiary candidates. Many efforts are on the increase of trying to design support programmes that are of a holistic and integrated nature, following a pipeline approach from early childhood development to youth development into employment, but many lack coherent, systematic, sustainable impact outcomes. The scarcity of financial resources also affects the sustainability of well-intentioned programmes. Another challenge hampering current practices is the buy-in of school communities and taking ownership of what external parties (like philanthropists) offer to their environment, in building on and driving change in a forward cycle.

My contention thus is that, in order to respond to the educational challenges, one needs a better understanding of what constitutes alternative practices of educational philanthropy in order to make a positive contribution to education.

In the following chapter I focus on findings in the literature on suggested alternative practices of philanthropy, with a special focus on educational philanthropy.

### **3.6 SUMMARY**

In this chapter I have provided an account of the importance of a literature review. I have attempted to analyse the concepts of “education” and “philanthropy”, and provided a literature review of historical developments and different forms of current practices in philanthropy.

The literature shows that most of the philanthropic giving initiated post-1994 was directed towards poverty alleviation, welfare and social development. Besides bursary opportunities for talented black children, not much focus was placed on educational philanthropy. It seems as if historical practices and motivations for giving are still in operation, and there does not seem to be a clear understanding of what philanthropy should constitute in post-apartheid South Africa. The literature makes a distinction between traditional forms of philanthropy and new ways of practices. It thus is evident from this literature review that the understandings and methodologies of current practices are not responding sufficiently to the educational challenges in the democratic education system.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES OF EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

#### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

It is evident that current practices of philanthropy are much needed to fill important development gaps and are critical if societies are to be developed to prosper. However, based on the previous chapter's analysis, the understandings underlying current practices of educational philanthropy are not sufficient for the educational challenges experienced in the South African education system. Thus one needs to look for possible alternative practices that hopefully could respond proactively to the educational challenges.

My intention in this chapter is not to prescribe specific formats or technical structures of practices, but rather to provide philosophical “meanings” of what could be the “make-up” of possible alternative practices for educational philanthropy in the South African context in order to contribute to meaningful change in education.

#### **4.2 ANALYSIS OF “ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES”**

Before I explored alternative practices of educational philanthropy, I asked myself what is the meaning of the concept, “alternative practices”? I however could not find meanings for “alternative practices” in the educational literature and therefore gathered information from [http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative\\_medicine](http://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative_medicine) accessed 8 April 2015, which outlines meanings of “alternative practices” in relation to the field of medicine.

Alternative medicine is made up of a wide range of health-care products, therapies and practices, where the common feature is a claim to heal that is not based on the scientific method. Alternative practices in medicine are diverse in their foundations and methodologies. These practices may be classified by their cultural origins or by the types of beliefs upon which they are based. Methods may incorporate or base themselves on traditional medicinal practices that are not necessarily based on a particular culture, folk knowledge, superstition, spiritual beliefs, belief in supernatural energies (antiscience), pseudoscience, errors in reasoning, propaganda, fraud, new or different concepts of health and disease, and any bases other than being proven by scientific methods. Different cultures may have their own unique traditional or belief-based

practices, developed either recently or over thousands of years, and specific practices or entire systems of practices. Alternative medical practices can be based on an underlying belief system inconsistent with science, or on traditional cultural practices. Alternative medical systems can be based on common belief systems that are not consistent with facts of science, such as in naturopathy or homeopathy.

This website states that distinctions also are made between “alternative medicine” and “complementary medicine”, but also mentions that these two overlap. The National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine (NCCAM) of the National Institutes of Health states that “alternative medicine” refers to using a non-mainstream approach in place of conventional medicine and that “complementary medicine” generally refers to using a non-mainstream approach together with conventional medicine, and comments that the boundaries between complementary and conventional medicine overlap and change with time.

My contention thus is that, although alternative educational philanthropy practices are diverse in their foundations, methodologies, cultural origins and types of belief systems, they consist of common features, such that people want to help and be of assistance to other human beings. I am in agreement that different cultures may have their own unique traditional or belief-based practices developed recently or over thousands of years, and specific practices or entire systems of practices.

#### **4.3 POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES IN THE LITERATURE**

In this chapter I will outline a few alternative practices of philanthropy as they are articulated in the literature. I then will draw on some of the concepts as outlined in these alternative practices in order to formulate some constitutive meanings towards my own understanding of what alternative practices of educational philanthropy could look like. Some of the alternative practices highlighted in the literature are called traditional philanthropy and social justice philanthropy.

### **4.3.1 TRADITIONAL PHILANTHROPY VS. SOCIAL JUSTICE PHILANTHROPY**

Mahomed (2008) distinguishes between traditional philanthropy and social justice philanthropy. Her study's findings are that traditional funders tend to locate the problem at the level of the individual. Their funding approach consequently tends to focus primarily on mitigating the impacts or alleviating the symptoms of the problem. This may assist people in the immediate crises that they face, but the status quo underlying these crises is not the subject of attention. Funders of this nature tend to emphasise interventions that provide direct services and address critical welfare needs as they affect individuals. Although these are critical interventions and fill important gaps, the reasons why these services are required in many cases are not focused on in the first place. Having said that, it does not imply that these activities are less valuable. These organisations/interventions play a valuable role in society, as they fund critical services that provide a physical, social, psychological or emotional safety net for people who are in crisis, and there clearly is a need for this type of support in the short term. Mahomed (2008:35) suggest that philanthropy needs to look at both the symptoms and the causes of social injustice. She (Mahomed, 2008:74) also concludes that, for the most part in South Africa, organisations end to adopt a traditional philanthropy approach rather than a social justice philanthropy approach.

I now turn my focus to outlining the concept of traditional philanthropy.

#### **4.3.1.1 TRADITIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

According to Mahomed's (2008) findings, traditional funders conceptualise their rationale and goals as being premised on notions of assistance, charity and development, and tend to locate the crises people face at the level of the individual; as a result, their funding is primarily directed at mitigating the impacts of crises.

Traditional funders thus:

- i) tend to focus on their role as grant makers and conduits of funding for larger donors;
- ii) tend to see the State as the authority on the broad development imperatives; and
- iii) see their grant beneficiaries as undertaking initiatives that fit within these imperatives.

As these traditional funders try to navigate between the different role players and find their appropriate role within the broader environment, these traditional funders adopt a neutral role



that constrains them from addressing certain types of contentious contextual issues or power dynamics. Traditional funders tend to engage in learning and reflection that prioritises a focus on technical issues and impacts and have boards that conduct due diligence requirements on primarily technical issues and impacts. Mahomed (2008:76) concluded in her study that traditional funders play a valuable role in South Africa, but on their own is constrained. My own understanding of this concept lies in the fact that “traditional” would refer to something that has a strong, set (fixed) history, having being done over years in the same type of manner, by more or less the same ideology, and seldom changed. In my view it thus is even more important to look at alternative ways of understanding and to ‘re-construct’ the concept of philanthropy if one wants to understand how it can play a role in an education system that evolved over the years. Mahomed (2008) offers an alternative to traditional philanthropy, being social justice philanthropy, which I now turn to.

#### **4.3.1.2 SOCIAL JUSTICE PHILANTHROPY**

As this study investigated alternative practices of philanthropy in education, I would agree with Mahomed (2008) that traditional philanthropy in education needs to be supplemented by a social justice philanthropy approach, which can play an instrumental role in supporting and strengthening an active and dynamic civil society that can help shape South Africa’s social justice agenda. I now will elaborate on the social justice philanthropy approach.

Halima Mahomed (2008:1) explored the different motivations underlying the funding approaches of independent funders in South Africa in her research study titled: “Philanthropy and social justice in South Africa: Addressing underlying causes or mitigating impact?” She highlights how, despite a progressive constitution and the promulgation of various policies that entrench and promote basic human rights, the struggle for freedom and democracy in South Africa has not translated into the attainment of a just society. Amongst its multitude of challenges, the democratic state has struggled to realise its progressive ideals on the issues of poverty, inequality, vulnerability and discrimination.

Consequently, Mahomed (2008) states, South African non-governmental organisations (NGOs), academic institutions, social movements and trade unions have voiced their concern that the policies adopted by the state have entrenched progressive rights as ideals, but have not changed the underlying dynamics and structural issues that prevent its citizens from realising

these rights. More and more civil society institutions engage the state in efforts to inform, stimulate and influence policies and programmes that are directed at transforming the structural inequalities that underlie social injustice.

Mahomed (2008:1) describes how some of these civil society institutions are funded by philanthropic resources, which she put into two categories of types of funding. The type of funding that supports civil society efforts to address the structural dynamics underlying social injustice are referred to as social justice philanthropy, although the practicing thereof is not as common amongst South African funders. Mahomed quotes Kuljian (2005), who refers to philanthropic support efforts that seek to mitigate the impacts of poverty and inequality as traditional philanthropy. Her study explores why it is the case that independent funders engage in philanthropy that addresses the impacts of social injustice or its underlying causes.

Through her research, Mahomed (2008:1) found that independent funders in South Africa adopt a more nuanced approach that lies between traditional welfare philanthropy and social justice philanthropy. However, she adapted the social justice philanthropy to the South African context, in which she identified five critical components:

- i) it is premised on rights-based values;
- ii) it is an overall funding approach;
- iii) it is contextual;
- iv) its processes are inclusive; and
- v) it can be directed at both individual and community/society-level interventions.

Each of the components will be explained briefly according to Mahomed (2008), and in a next chapter I will analyse them in relation to educational philanthropy.

#### **i) What is meant by right-based values?**

According to Mahomed (2008:29), social justice philanthropy in South Africa is as much about why funding is given as it is about the impact of the funding. Organisations engaging in this type of philanthropy place emphasis on the fact that the funding they engage in is not motivated by a desire to help or be charitable, but that their existence is based on values that refer to every individual's right to justice, equality, equity and dignity in every sphere of life. So they distinguish their work according to the motivation underlying their funding.

**ii) What is meant by approach?**

Mahomed (2008:30) states that the social justice philanthropy approach includes addressing the impacts of problems, but ultimately is aimed at addressing the contextual issues that contribute to the problem. It does not ignore the realities of the multiple crises related to poverty, vulnerability and inequality. In the South African context, the same funder thus can support initiatives that address both immediate needs as well as underlying contextual issues within a single, holistic approach. It thus can be seen as one strategic approach with multiple strategies.

**iii) What is meant by contextual?**

Mahomed (2008:29) reflects how the focus on structural change is a common thread through the literature. Many practitioners thus will talk about change, but not necessarily “structural change”. The concept of “structural change” can and does have many meanings, and can comprise different layers; furthermore, at what point an intervention constitutes a structural change intervention can be a subjective issue. The idea of contextual change appears to have much more resonance. Mahomed thus concludes that a social justice philanthropy approach takes account of the underlying contextual dynamics surrounding an issue or a problem, and then looks at how to address the problem by changing the underlying contextual dynamics.

**iv) What is meant by inclusive?**

Mahomed (2008:30) regards social justice philanthropy to be both about strategy and process. A critical component of this approach is the interaction with the beneficiaries of the support as equal partners, with respect for their priorities, needs and plans, and adopting the principle that grant-making decisions will be informed by issues articulated by those most affected. Mahomed thus concludes that the idea that funding decisions cannot be taken in isolation of in-depth engagement with those most affected is a central element of social justice philanthropy.

**v) Why individual and societal?**

According to Mahomed (2008:31), the literature tends to refer primarily to structural issues as relating to a direct impact on the community or society level. Philanthropy directed toward benefitting individuals does not receive significant attention. Mahomed contends that, in the South African context with its critical transformation agenda, individual-level support is just as crucial as societal-level change, and the development of individual leadership, competencies, assets and skills is seen as critical to bringing about social change and a just society.

Mahomed (2008:31) constructed a definition of social justice philanthropy from a South African perspective as:

An inclusive funding approach, premised on the notion of a just society, which seeks to ultimately address the contextual issues and barriers that prevent (i) the recognition of equal rights for all, (ii) equitable opportunities to access those rights and (iii) the realization of those rights into just outcomes for those who bear the brunt of poverty, marginalization, vulnerability, oppression and discrimination.

For the purpose of my study, in linking these concepts back to educational philanthropy the latter thus could be viewed, from a traditional philanthropy perspective, as philanthropic support in educational efforts that seek to mitigate the impacts of poverty and inequality affecting education.

On the other hand, educational philanthropy from a social justice philanthropy perspective thus might be viewed as having an inclusive funding approach, premised on the notion of a just educational system/society, which ultimately addresses the contextual issues and barriers that prevent (i) the recognition of equal educational rights of children, (ii) equitable opportunities to access those educational rights and (iii) the realisation of the those rights into just outcomes for children and youth, who bear the brunt of poverty, marginalisation, vulnerability, oppression and discrimination.

In my experience from working in the educational field, I have realised that one cannot talk about a school or higher education institution without recognising the surrounding communities' contributions to these institutions. Stated more simplistically, one cannot talk about the children or youth attending these institutions without recognising the roles of their parents, family and broader communities in their development. Philanthropists and philanthropic institutions thus would form part of these community stakeholders contributing to these educational institutions. I am drawing on two approaches recognised as community philanthropy approaches I have come across in literature, namely Philanthropy for Community (PfC) and Philanthropy of Community (PoC).

#### **4.3.2 PHILANTHROPY FOR COMMUNITY (PfC) VS. PHILANTHROPY OF COMMUNITY (PoC)**

Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) provide the Greek translation of the word “philanthropy” as being “love of humankind”. They also refer to a definition by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which sees philanthropy as “giving of time, money and know-how to advance the common good”. As mentioned earlier, the term “philanthropy”, although used in conversations, is unfamiliar and not widely used in the African context. Opposed to it, the term “help” is more generally used, as it has the advantage of implying a transaction, yet not business. According to Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009:5), the definition of help has emerged from research into the lived reality of the poor. Wilkinson-Maposa *et al.* (2009:36) define “help [as] the giving and/or receiving of something to satisfy or alleviate a need, a problem, a difficulty, a sense of deprivation or a lack of something, be it a tangible good/asset or ability”.

Wilkinson-Maposa contends that, in terms of this definition, help is a daily, lived reality and a necessity, not an exceptional event. She highlights a few features that are implicated in the definition of “help”. Asking for help brings no stigma, offering help without being asked thus is commonplace. Implicit in this is also that, no matter how little you have, you give – the act is more important than the quantum involved. Helping brings positive feelings that can be its own (spiritual or moral) reward. To qualify for “help”, assistance cannot be exploitive or demeaning. A recipient must deserve. This attribute, according to the author, is principally judged by an individual’s helping behaviour within their capabilities, and it is preferable to seek help from people who understand one’s situation by virtue of a shared condition or experience than from outsiders.

She also refers to ‘indigenous philanthropy’ which refers to what is local and home-grown, rather than what is first, original or “native”. Wilkinson-Maposa *et al.* (2009:7) refer to Ake (1988), who defines “indigenous philanthropy” as dynamic, assuming flexibility, variability and contemporariness. I will first describe PfC, and then PoC.

#### **4.3.2.1 PHILANTHROPY FOR COMMUNITY (PfC)**

Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009:8) describe philanthropy for community as being distinct from philanthropy of community. This “external” transfer is exemplified in development assistance and charity, and it is often underpinned by values of generosity and altruism.

#### **4.3.2.2 PHILANTHROPY OF COMMUNITY (PoC)**

Wilkinson-Maposa and (2009:2) introduce PoC, or Philanthropy of Community, which urges the grant maker to ask new questions and seek information on local helping systems. She urges for complexity to be engaged with as the phenomenon of help is culturally invested, dynamic and often far reaching. To build 'from', as opposed to 'on', requires the grant maker to change its practice – its mind-set, the language it uses and how it acts. By developing instruments, Wilkinson-Maposa (2009) contends that is not enough just to understand PoC. Rather, the process of engaging with it is critical to success. In her view, vulnerable communities find a PoC lens affirming and empowering in terms of recognising their assets and cultivating their resilience and ability to bring about change.

I now will explore the features of a PoC method as an alternative way of philanthropy for education.

According to Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:5), the idea of community philanthropy comes from the root concepts, which the European Foundation Centre defines as “the giving by individuals and local institutions of their goods or money along with the time and skills to promote the well-being of others and the betterment of the communities in which they live and work”. The author points out that Gilbert (2006) who highlights the main features in this definition: community philanthropy is a collective act, and it promotes the well-being and betterment of others. As part of Wilkinson-Maposa and other researchers inquiries into indigenous philanthropy in South Africa, the notions of community philanthropy have been refined further to identify two types of community philanthropy:

- a) Philanthropy of Community (PoC), which refers to resources that are mobilised within a community for its own use
- b) Philanthropy for Community (PfC), which refers to resources that are mobilised by one community for another community. These two systems therefore co-exist.

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:5) also refers to the terms “horizontal philanthropy” and “vertical philanthropy”, which are also interchangeably used to describe PoC and PfC respectively. Vertical philanthropy signifies that resources flow one way from “the haves” to “the have-nots”, or from a giver to a receiver. Horizontal philanthropy describes the sideways flow of resources back and forth among and between givers and receivers.

I now will look at key elements of the philanthropy of community model.

#### **4.3.2.2.1 FIVE KEY DIMENSIONS OF PHILANTHROPY OF COMMUNITY (PoC)**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:6) describes five key dimensions that characterise PoC, namely:

- a) Needs and networks
- b) Range of capitals mobilised
- c) Maintaining and moving
- d) Norms and conventions of decision making
- e) Philosophy of the collective self

Each of these is now explained in more detail.

##### **a) Needs and networks**

According to Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:6), any individual living in poverty suffers from needs, which drive people to seek help from, and provide help to, one another. She categorise needs as being “normal” or “urgent”. She elaborates that “normal needs” can be anticipated and planned for, are typically small, regular and frequent, and include daily use, short-term and gap-filling necessities (such as cooking oil, blankets, minding children or providing company for an elderly person). In education it would be physical or infrastructural resources at schools, like stationery, teaching and learning aids, learners’ school uniforms, playground upgrades, etc. These needs are often satisfied through reciprocity between individuals and the return is rapid.

The author elaborates how “urgent needs” are immediate and unplanned for. Urgent needs may be generated by emergencies and may also be dangerous levels of debt or financial constraints. Urgent needs thus require a rapid response and can demand a significant contribution in relation to available resources. Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:6) contends that this demand is often too much for one individual and requires a group or collective response that may be spontaneous or pre-planned. Both normal and urgent needs can be satisfied by either a group or an individual. Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:7) contends that, put together, these practices create networks that can mobilise resources and address needs. Networks are shaped by needs, but also by relationships or by proximity. Networks may also be informal or more formalised. Through

these networks, people share risk and “invest” in future help by developing a base of different sources of assistance.

**b) Range of capitals mobilised**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:7) distinguish that help offered may be material (e.g. money or goods, etc.) or non-material (e.g. knowledge, contacts, access to social networks, etc.). Both types of contributions are valued highly by those who are receiving them.

**c) Maintaining and moving**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:7) explains that the motivations and effects of PoC can be placed along a “maintenance and movement” spectrum that connects help to poverty alleviation. She mentions how help may be used to stop someone slipping into further deprivation, e.g. to maintain someone at their current position with respect to poverty and adversity. People generally are most concerned with the present and assist one another in meeting basic, pressing needs such as food and clothing. At the other end of the spectrum, help is motivated by and used for escape from poverty and adversity. She concludes that the poor, despite a thin financial or material base, mobilise and share their resources on a regular and frequent basis. Poverty thus is not a deterrent to self-help and mutual assistance.

**d) Norms and conventions of decision making**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:7) is of the opinion that people help each other according to unwritten yet widely understood customs. She further elaborates that the system is supported by the principle that no matter how little you have, you give, and held together by loose but binding agreements about terms and conditions. She regards PoC as informal and unofficial, but it is neither disorderly nor random and is held together by widely accepted ways of behaving, using shared principles and conventions.

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:8) divide a typical help act into the following steps:

1. A transaction is initiated: help is asked for or offered.
2. The request is screened: the giver decides whether he/she is able or willing to offer help (e.g. whether the person being helped is eligible).
3. Help is offered.
4. The actors establish an agreement on the terms and conditions of the help (e.g. repayment, etc.).



5. There are rewards or sanctions for following the conventions or not doing so – the actors can be corrected, isolated/not helped again or helped again.

The “helping act” process in educational philanthropy also can be aligned to a project management cycle, being:

1. The philanthropist identifies an area for support.
2. A situation analysis or baseline assessment is conducted to understand the level for interventions.
3. Reflections on, clarifications of and formulation of holistic and multi-pronged support processes.
4. Developing an overall strategy and implementation plan.
5. Identification of programme-implementing partners, either in the internal or external environment.
6. Agreements and funding are finalised.
7. Programme implementation starts.
8. Quality assurance, monitoring and evaluation follow.
9. Reporting and revision of strategy.

Together with this, Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:8) includes a few principles of the ethos of offering help:

- i) The givers and receivers of help are active and purposeful. They ensure that needs are clearly communicated and follow a known set of conventions and agreements.
- ii) The poor invest in and sustain relationships of trust, respect and mutuality. Reputation is of high importance.
- iii) Under the conditions of high need and a thin resource base (characteristic of poverty), the poor generally expect something in return and see resource mobilisation as an investment.
- iv) There also is a tendency to stretch resources, optimising what is available. The poor pool contributions, and often combine different forms of help to circulate resources further through different circuits.
- v) The poor adopt a multi-pronged approach. They do not rely on one instrument, but spread risk and increase opportunity by combining those help options best suited to the needs.

**e) Philosophy of the collective self**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:8) stresses that the values that underpin the notion of help are based on an understanding that people do not exist in isolation, as is expressed in the moral philosophy of “Ubuntu”. Help is not always an act of free choice, but can be driven by duty or obligation, making help something one has to do. On the other hand, she stresses that receiving can also be an obligation, in that rejecting help can be seen as rude or socially unacceptable. She concludes that offering help is motivated by three core principles, namely altruism, reciprocity and co-operation, which I will define briefly according to Wilkinson-Maposa (2009). Altruistic giving is done in terms of compassion and pity. It is often prompted by religious beliefs, including a search for ‘blessings’, and tends to be directed at a particular recipient group, which includes the poorest of the poor, strangers or people who cannot take care of themselves. She is of the opinion that there is a widespread understanding that one has to assist those who cannot look after themselves. Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:9) refers to reciprocity as help that is grounded in mutuality, which carries a sense of obligation and commitment to return the favour. One would feel obliged to help the one that helps you so that you can be helped in the future. The notion of being a form of “savings” therefore is linked to reciprocity. She contends that this sentiment shows that help is also a strategy of personal capital formation and risk-spreading. According to Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:9), co-operation involves complying with a set of rules that are in everyone’s interest, and refers to the call to all actors to do their part for the good of all. She makes the point that community is driven by the belief that we can do together what we cannot achieve alone, and co-operation is grounded in mutual benefit.

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:37) fits the PoC approach into two paradigms that are well known in the development community.

**4.4 TWO PARADIGMS WITHIN THE PHILANTHROPY OF COMMUNITY (PoC) APPROACH**

The first paradigm is an asset-based approach to development, and the second is a consideration of civic-driven changes.

**4.4.1 Asset-based approach to development**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:37) is of the opinion that an asset-based approach can be difficult, as those who help the poor are often encouraged to focus on community problems and “deficiencies”. Worse still is the tendency to magnify these deficiencies in order to source funding to address the problems. She regards the framing of communities in terms of a need or a problem as the fostering of a “poverty consciousness” amongst people in poor communities, as communities are asked to voice their degree of need and engage with external “experts” who bring “solutions”. The author says this can create dependency and competition for resources and regards asset-based community development (ABCD) as an alternative to the needs-based approach, as it focuses attention on, and encourages appreciation of, the positive assets and strengths in communities. She contends that the intention is to surface these hidden “gifts” through appreciate inquiry and to cultivate a positive vision for the future. ABCD is optimistic and assumes that:

- meaningful and lasting community change always comes from within;
- every person has capacities, abilities and gifts; and
- local residents are experts and key agents.

I now will provide a brief description of the civic-driven change approach.

#### **4.4.2 Civic-driven change**

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:38) describes this paradigm as approaching communities from a mind-set that assumes that there is something to build from. She says grant makers (philanthropists) should guard against these assumptions and consider the following:

- That nothing “philanthropic” existed prior to an external intervention, or that anecdotal information is sufficient.
- Rather to consider that a local ethos and idiom of help may exist and needs should be mapped out and understood.
- That what happens below organised structures at the informal group, household or individual level is irrelevant to organised philanthropy.
- Rather to consider that what happens at this micro-level might not be seen as “private”, but may be regarded locally as a “public” concern and a community matter.
- Knowledge and experience are relevant to resource mobilisation and their use is in the domain of formal organisations.

- Rather to consider what informal associations and individuals know as the guardians and proponents of a local ethos of help.
- Not to assume that asset accumulation and absolute value are sufficient indicators of success.
- Rather to explore and develop a broader spectrum of indicators that reflect the range of resources brought to the table and their value.
- Also not to assume that external interventions will “do least harm”. Rather develop a baseline and indicator to measure and monitor the impact of grant-making assistance on the local help systems that exist.
- Furthermore, also not to assume that the highest level of accountability is to investors/donors and/or compliance with public policy and organisational parameters. Rather consider that there also is accountability to the community for the effect and impact that philanthropic contributions have on poverty alleviation, social cohesion/community building as well as survival, coping systems and networks.

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:42) concludes her discussion on the PoC approach by stating that the following guiding principles be used in applying this perspective in a constructive manner:

- honour and respect the organic, but do not romanticise poverty;
- refrain from taxing the poor further in the name of local resource mobilisation and poverty reduction;
- take care not to “professionalise” or formalise the organic; and
- recognise the limitations of indigenous philanthropy.

She and other contributors to her research have made it clear that there are many ways of looking at and understanding a community. In the PoC approach, the focus is on the way individuals and groups help one another, and on the inherent value for members of the aid community to learn from communities with regard to how they help themselves. It thus is hoped that this approach will lead to building (instead of undermining) the communities we are trying to help and will transform philanthropy to work towards sustainability and building stronger communities.

Alternative practices of philanthropy are also described in concepts such as corporate social responsibility, venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship. An approach within these kinds of giving is strategic philanthropy, which I also explore. My question is thus whether

there is anything that we can learn from these concepts and understandings in the educational field? In order to answer this question I briefly explain each of the concepts according to the literature.

According to Porter and Kramer (2002:5), corporate philanthropy is increasingly used as a form of public relations or advertising, promoting a company's image or brand through cause-related marketing or other high-profile sponsorships. While these activities do provide much-needed support to worthy causes, they are intended as much to increase company visibility and improve employee morale as to create social impact. On the other hand there are genuine doubts about whether such approaches actually work, or whether they just breed public cynicism about company motives.

Porter and Kramer (2002:5) describe this as the 'haziness' surrounding corporate philanthropy. They describe how the majority of corporate contribution programmes are diffuse and unfocused. Most consist of numerous small cash donations given to aid local civic causes or provide general operating support to universities and national charities in the hope of generating goodwill among employees, customers and the local community. Rather than being tied to well thought-out social or business objectives, the contributions often reflect the personal beliefs and values of executives or employees.

One of the most popular approaches – employee-matching grants, or employee-initiated social projects – explicitly leaves the choice of charity to the individual worker. Although aimed at enhancing morale, the same effect might be gained from an equal increase in wages that employees then could choose to donate to charity on a tax-deductible basis. It does seem that individuals donating their own money would better make many of the giving decisions companies make today. All reasonable corporate expenditures are deductible, and companies get no special tax advantage for spending on philanthropy as opposed to other corporate purposes. If cause-related marketing is good marketing, it is already deductible and does not benefit from being designated as charitable. According to the author, this argument makes two implicit assumptions. The first is that social and economic objectives are separate and distinct, so that a corporation's social spending comes at the expense of its economic results. The second is the assumption that corporations, when they address social objectives, provide no greater benefit than is provided by individual donors. Porter and Kramer (2002:6) contend that this

assumption holds true when corporate contributions are unfocused and piecemeal, as is typically the case with corporate philanthropy today.

The authors suggest that there can be a more strategic way of thinking about philanthropy. Corporations can use their charitable efforts to improve their competitive context – being described as the quality of the business environment in the location or locations where they operate. Using philanthropy to enhance context brings social and economic goals into alignment and improves a company's long-term business prospects. Furthermore, to this this, addressing context enables a company not only to give money, but also to leverage its capabilities and relationships in support of charitable causes. This produces social benefits far exceeding those provided by individual donors, foundations, or even government.

Context-focused giving thus contradicts the authors' aforementioned two assumptions (Porter & Kramer, 2002:7). An example the author refers to in the article of a company using context-focused philanthropy to achieve both social and economic gains is Cisco Systems, which invests in an ambitious educational programme called the Cisco Networking Academy. The programme's aim is to train computer network administrators, thereby alleviating a potential constraint on its growth while providing attractive job opportunities to high school graduates. By focusing on social needs that affect its corporate context, and utilising its unique attributes as a corporation to address them, Cisco has begun to demonstrate the unrealised potential of corporate philanthropy. The author contend that, for companies to take this new direction requires fundamental changes in the way companies approach their contribution programmes. Corporations need to rethink both where they focus their philanthropy, and how they go about their giving (Porter & Kramer, 2002:7).

In the long run, social and economic goals are not inherently conflicting, but integrally connected. Competitiveness today depends on the productivity with which companies can use labour, capital and natural resources to produce high-quality goods and services. Productivity depends on having workers who are educated, safe, healthy, decently housed and motivated by a sense of opportunity. Preserving the environment benefits not only society, but companies too. Boosting social and economic conditions in developing countries thus can create more productive locations for a company's operations as new markets for its products.

It is indeed a learning that the most effective method of addressing many of the world's pressing problems is often to mobilise the corporate sector in ways that benefit both society and companies. It is thus where corporate philanthropy has an important influence on a company's competitive context that philanthropy is truly strategic (Porter & Kramer, 2002:7). Porter and Kramer (2002) contend that understanding the link between philanthropy and competitive context assists companies to identify where they should focus their corporate giving. Understanding the ways in which philanthropy creates value highlights how they can achieve the greatest social and economic impact through their contributions. The where and how thus are mutually reinforcing. Porter and Kramer (2002:11) outline four ways in which charitable foundations as well as corporate giving can create social value and have greater impact, through selecting the best grantees, signalling other funders, improving the performance of grant recipients and advancing knowledge and practice in the field.

Porter and Kramer's (2002) article is in congruence with my experience of trying to influence corporations through the provision of strategic leadership in the adoption of a context-focused corporate philanthropy approach. Some of the challenges are that corporate social responsibility programmes lack well-thought-through and well-planned strategies. Very often it is about short-term, once-off projects with high marketing benefits, but with no long-term sustainable impact on the external environment. There is an increased focus on educational projects by South African companies focusing on in-school or afterschool enhancement programmes, with the target groups being the leadership, teachers and learners, or learner's parents. Youth development and tertiary bursary support also seems to be on the increase. For me, the challenge lies in how companies understand and interpret the educational needs and challenges, as well as the understanding of development as being a long-term process, in order to respond effectively and appropriately with their corporate philanthropy programmes. I thus would agree with Porter and Kramer (2002:6) that true strategic giving addresses important social and economic goals simultaneously, targeting areas of competitive context where the company and society both benefit because the firm brings unique assets and expertise, thus leading to enhanced goodwill from the company. In recent years there has been an increased focus on concepts such as corporate philanthropy and strategic philanthropy.

I now briefly will explain two additional alternative philanthropic practices, namely venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship. Van Slyke and Newman (2006:345) contend that venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship are relatively new concepts and have only

begun to be examined in the non-profit and philanthropy literature. A 1997 Harvard Business Review article by Letts, Ryan and Grossman (Van Slyke & Newman, 2006) argues that traditional philanthropy could benefit from infusing techniques used by venture capitalists. While a clear definition of venture philanthropy has not yet been devised, the concept has received wide discussion and consideration in professional philanthropic circles (Van Slyke & Newman, 2006:346). Most venture philanthropy organisations are relatively new, and three fourths were founded after 1999, according to a survey of thirty-seven such organisations done by Community Wealth Ventures (2001). Morino (2004, in Van Slyke & Newman, 2006:347) regards the relationship between the venture philanthropist and the “investment partner”, traditionally referred to as the grantee, as more intensive, frequent and engaging than traditional philanthropic relationships between a foundation (funder) or individual donor and a non-profit organisation (grantee or grant recipient).

Another description of venture philanthropy is “high-engagement philanthropy” because of the level of commitment and investment the venture philanthropist makes in the organisation beyond a financial contribution (Van Slyke & Newman, 2006:347). Morino and Shore (in Van Slyke & Newman, 2006:347) elaborate that venture philanthropists and their investment partners are often described as funders for “aspiring social innovators”, in which both the philanthropist and the investment partner/social entrepreneur seek to change “public systems” for which change is desperately needed, but sorely lacking and frequently underfunded. They regard it as critical for the effectiveness of the philanthropic and operational investment.

The authors identified several attributes that contribute to their understanding of the concept “venture philanthropy”. Techniques associated with venture capitalists include “substantial investments of both growth capital and strategic assistance” (Van Slyke & Newman, 2006). In contrast to a traditional, hands-off charitable grant awarded to a non-profit organisation by a community, private or corporate foundation, venture philanthropists and their philosophy of high-engagement regard funding as a long-term investment. The investments of strategic assistance and capitalisation are intended and designed to build organisational systems and capacity focused on achieving lasting outcomes for the clients they serve.

Van Slyke and Newman (2006) stress that the discussion of capacity building by venture philanthropists, are refer to as investments in the organisational infrastructure, management and



decision making, and governance with the non-profit they are funding. This involvement frequently takes the form of working with the non-profit organisation's leadership to think about how strategic goals and objectives are aligned with the organisation's mission and client needs, how and in what form initiatives are to be implemented, and performance. Their involvement also includes assessing the effectiveness of the clients and communities they are serving as part of their mission. Morino and Shore (in Van Slyke & Newman, 2006:348) contend that venture philanthropists' strategic assistance is also directed at "accessing networks and leveraging relationships that can be beneficial to the operational and fiscal health of the organization".

Lastly I will discuss the concept of "social entrepreneurship" as another alternative practice of philanthropy. As with the work on venture philanthropy, the research and literature on social entrepreneurship has only recently begun to develop, although the work to date has largely built on earlier research on entrepreneurship in general. Dees et al. (2002) mention how the concept of social entrepreneurship means different things to different people, although it is generally agreed that "it combines the passion of a social mission with an image of business-like discipline, innovation and determination commonly associated with ... the high-tech pioneers of Silicon Valley". Van Slyke and Newman (2006:348) cite Alvord, Brown and Letts (2003:137), who emphasise the innovative character in the definition of social entrepreneurship. They also refer to Dees (2001:4), who suggests five characteristics that make social entrepreneurs different from business entrepreneurs, namely social entrepreneurs act as change agents in the social sector by:

- a) adopting a mission to create and sustain social value;
- b) recognising and relentlessly pursuing new opportunities to serve that mission;
- c) engaging in a process of continuous innovation, adaptation and learning;
- d) acting boldly without being limited by resources in hand; and
- e) exhibiting heightened accountability to the constituencies served for the outcomes created.

In subsequent work Dees *et al.* (2002) suggest that a social entrepreneur is one who develops a "strategic service vision, a competitive strategy, a strategy for building networks and partnerships, leads, retains, and rewards people, manages (their board) entrepreneurially, treats donors as investors, work with (different) communities, develops viable earned income

strategies, considers the scale of the project and strategies for success and is able to manage organizational change”.

In trying to construct my own understanding of what could constitute alternative practices in educational philanthropy, I will now draw from these suggested approaches and principles in these philanthropy practices as outlined in the literature review.

#### **4.5 CONSTITUTIVE MEANINGS OF CONCEPTS RELATING TO ALTERNATIVE PRACTICES CONCEPTUALISED FOR EDUCATIONAL PHILANTHROPY**

I will now draw on meanings articulated in the literature review on alternative philanthropic practices that could relate to educational philanthropy.

4.5.1 Within traditional philanthropy, assistance/help is given to people with an immediate crisis. The emphasis is on interventions that provide direct services and address critical welfare needs as they affect individuals. This plays a valuable role, but on its own is constrained.

4.5.2 Within social justice philanthropy, assistance/help is given to address structural dynamics underlying social injustice. Critical components of this kind of philanthropy are that it is:

- premised on rights-based values, meaning that giving to education is based on children's rights to receive quality education
- an overall funding approach; it can support initiatives that address both the immediate needs of schools and higher education institutions, as well as underlying contextual issues within a single holistic approach.
- contextual, which refers to the contextual dynamics surrounding the issue or development problem the schools or higher education institutions might experience.
- inclusive processes, which refers to the interaction between donors and beneficiaries as equal partners, with respect for each other's priorities, needs and plans.
- directed at both individual and community-level interventions, which refers to the need for individual support being just as crucial as societal-level change, and the development of individual leadership, competencies, assets and skills is seen as critical to bringing about social change and a just society.

4.5.3 Within indigenous philanthropy, assistance/help can be viewed as philanthropy in schools or higher education institutions that is local and home-grown, thus dynamic, variable and contemporary.

4.5.4 Philanthropy for community is based on development assistance or charity underpinned by values of generosity and altruism, from those who have towards schools and higher education institutions that have less.

4.5.5 Philanthropy of community urges the grant maker to ask new questions and seek information on local helping systems for schools and higher education institutions and communities. It is about affirming and empowering the educational communities, recognising their assets and cultivating their resilience and ability to bring about change. Five characteristics of this kind of philanthropy for educational communities are:

- Needs and networks, which refer to individuals or groups who satisfy the needs of the educational communities. These networks, which are shaped by needs, relationships and proximity, can mobilise resources and address needs.
- The range of capitals mobilised for schools or higher education institutions can be material (e.g. money or goods) or non-material (knowledge, contacts, access to social networks etc.).
- The motivations and effects of this kind of philanthropy can be placed along a maintenance and movement spectrum that connects help to poverty alleviation for schools and higher education institutions. It thus can help these educational communities or institutions escape from poverty and adversity, or help them slip into further deprivation.
- Norms and conventions of decision-making refer to communities in schools and higher education institutions that help each other according to unwritten yet widely understood customs. This system is supported by the principle of no matter how little you have, you give, and is held together by loose but binding agreements about terms and conditions. Although this kind of philanthropy is informal and unofficial, it is neither disorderly nor random and is held together by widely accepted ways of behaving, using shared principles and conventions.
- Philosophy of the collective self refers to the understanding that people do not exist in isolation, as expressed in the moral philosophy of 'Ubuntu'. Schools and higher

education communities thus realise that they exist not because and only for themselves, but because of who they are in relation to others.

4.5.6 The two paradigms within the philanthropy of community approach refer to the asset-based approach to development, which is an alternative to the needs-based approach. It focuses attention on and encourages appreciation of the positive assets and strengths in school and higher education communities. The other paradigm is based on civic-driven change, which approaches communities from a mind-set that there already is something (development) to build from.

4.5.7 Corporate philanthropy in education might enhance the competitive context – meaning enhancing the quality of the business environment in the location in which it operates by enhancing opportunities for the children of the local surrounding community through improvements in the social and economic context.

4.5.8 Social entrepreneurship is where a strategic service vision, competitive strategy, or strategy for building networks and partnerships can be formulated and managed, with schools as part of the organisational development.

4.5.9 Venture philanthropy, also referred to as “high-engagement philanthropy”, regards funding as long term, and provides a large investment of growth capital and strategic assistance. This kind of philanthropy also intends to build organisational capacity and assess the effectiveness of the clients and communities it is serving.

It is evident that in each concept of philanthropic practice outlined in this chapter’s literature review, there are numerous hidden assumptions and various interpretations that one can learn from and relate to in educational philanthropy. Many questions on each understanding extracted from the literature review can still be asked if deeper analysis is still to be continued with. For the purpose of this study it was important to highlight a few current and emerging philanthropic practices as alternatives from which one can draw in the practice of educational philanthropy.

## **4.6 SUMMARY**

In this chapter I tried to point out that, in order for philanthropy to make a meaningful contribution, it will have to re-evaluate its current practices and conceptualise new ways of ‘philanthropy’ or ‘help’ as articulated in the literature. I have highlighted a few alternative practices as articulated in the literature, including the following: Traditional Philanthropy, Social Justice Philanthropy, Philanthropy for Community and Philanthropy of Community, with the latter consisting of five key dimensions and two approaches, namely asset-based and civic-driven approaches. I have extracted and suggested a few constitutive meanings that might be considered in the practice of educational philanthropy. As Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:37) contend, organisations have to re-conceptualise the idea of philanthropy as a one-way flow from the wealthy to the poor; re-evaluate what constitutes assets; and learn to recognise helping norms as an asset and agency with poor communities. Funding should be seen as building on what is already there, rather than being the sole provider of assistance. Furthermore, philanthropists will have to recognise the time needed to invest in establishing a trusting relationship with the community and to help them map their assets.

## CHAPTER 5

### FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

I started this research study based on my practical experience of working in the field of educational philanthropy and observing a number of misunderstandings and gaps in the educational development field. My contention is that the concept of philanthropy is not familiar in all spheres, and where it is used, it is differently understood, interpreted and thus differently practised. With this study I wanted to gain a deeper understanding of how the concept of philanthropy, and especially educational philanthropy, is articulated in the literature, what meanings are hidden in the concept and what current practices of philanthropy exist. Making my study relevant for the educational field, my research dealt with the question of what alternative practices of educational philanthropy exist that might respond sufficiently to educational challenges.

I thus started off in Chapter 1 by briefly outlining the background to educational philanthropy and why the study is of significance. I provided the research procedures, which included the research question, research method and methodologies, which included the interpretive and critical inquiries. Key concepts I will reflect on during the study were also clarified.

In Chapter 2 I set out to make sense of and understand what philosophical inquiry, conceptual analysis and philosophy of education constitute in order to question the underlying presuppositions and assumptions in the concepts of educational philanthropy. I showed why I chose three specific methods of philosophical inquiry and how the contributions of interpretive inquiry and critical theory as methodologies could be regarded as appropriate research methodologies to use for my study.

Chapter 3 outlined what the literature provides as meanings of philanthropy and the different kinds of philanthropy practices abroad and in South Africa. Some of the practices highlighted how philanthropy has contributed to educational development in South Africa. This chapter also involved elaboration on different meanings of the concept of education from the literature.

I provided an outline of the developments in education post-1994 and what strengths the democratic education system has. I therefore constructed the concept of educational philanthropy and how it was linked to my research question.

From the literature it is evident that educational challenges still persist in the democratic education system, which cannot only rely on state capacity, resources and finances. External support and assistance thus is needed from multi-sectoral stakeholders if appropriate and sufficient educational development is to be achieved. The literature also showed how the current practices of educational philanthropy are not sufficient for the educational challenges highlighted.

In Chapter 4 I embarked on a literature review on alternative practices of philanthropy as articulated in the literature. It is evident that different understandings exist within the traditional philanthropy sphere, and that there also are newly constructed forms of philanthropy. I highlighted forms of philanthropic practices such as social justice philanthropy, and two approaches within community philanthropy, namely philanthropy for community and philanthropy of community. I also elaborated on two paradigms within the philanthropy of community approach that could be relevant to educational development. I also briefly introduced emerging philanthropic practices that could be beneficial for educational development, namely corporate philanthropy, social entrepreneurship and venture philanthropy. In this final chapter I bring my study to conclusion and reflect on the usefulness of my method and methodology. I then discuss the main findings of this study and make recommendations for further studies. I also reflect on the limitations of this study and provide a narrative reflection on my journey with this study.

## **5.2 METHODS AND METHODOLOGY**

I found that a philosophical inquiry provided me with the conceptual tools to explore and clarify my research question. I used three methods of inquiry, namely conceptual analysis, exploring hidden assumptions underlying a particular view or broader school of thought, and questioning the practice of educational philanthropy. I also used interpretive inquiry and critical theory as my research methodology.

### 5.3 MAIN FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

My assumption while practicing is that there are different meanings and hidden assumptions attached to the concept of educational philanthropy. The literature confirmed my assumptions through the various meanings that were highlighted throughout the literature review. Although there are different existing and emerging philanthropic practices, there are a few general concepts that one can draw from the latter practices that could serve as recommendable constitutive meanings (“the make-up”) of educational philanthropy, which are presented as the findings of this study:

- Within traditional philanthropy, assistance or help is given to people experiencing immediate crises. The emphasis lies on interventions that provide direct services and address critical welfare needs as they are affecting individuals. Although it plays a valuable role, it is not constrained on its own.
- Within social justice philanthropy, assistance/help is given to address structural dynamics underlying social injustice.

Critical components of this kind of philanthropy are that it is:

- premised on rights-based values, meaning that giving to education is based on children’s rights to receive quality education;
- an overall funding approach; it can support initiatives that address both the immediate needs of schools and higher education institutions, as well as underlying contextual issues within a single holistic approach;
- contextual, which refers to the contextual dynamics surrounding the issue or development problem the schools or higher education institutions might experience;
- inclusive processes, which refers to the interaction between donors and beneficiaries as equal partners, with respect for each other’s priorities, needs and plans;
- directed at both individual and community-level interventions, which refers to the need for individual support (for instance school fees or tertiary study bursaries) being just as crucial as societal-level change, and the development of individual leadership, competencies, assets and skills is seen as critical to bringing about social change and a just society.

Within indigenous philanthropy, assistance/help is philanthropy in schools or higher education institutions that is local and home-grown, thus dynamic, variable and contemporary.



Philanthropy for community is based on development assistance or charity, underpinned by values of generosity and altruism from those who have towards schools and higher education institutions that have less.

Philanthropy of community urges the grant maker to ask new questions and seek information on local helping systems for schools and higher education institutions and communities. It is about affirming and empowering the educational communities, recognising their assets and cultivating their resilience and ability to bring about change. Five characteristics of this kind of philanthropy for educational communities are:

- Needs and networks, which refer to individuals or groups who satisfy the needs of the educational communities. These networks, which are shaped by needs, relationships and proximity, can mobilise resources and address needs.
- The range of capitals mobilised for schools or higher education institutions can be material (e.g. money or goods) or non-material (knowledge, contacts, access to social networks, etc.).
- The motivations and effects of this kind of philanthropy can be placed along a maintenance and movement spectrum that connects help to poverty alleviation for schools and higher education institutions. It thus can help these educational communities or institutions escape from poverty and adversity, or help them slip into further deprivation.
- Norms and conventions of decision making refer to communities in schools and higher education institutions that help each other according to unwritten yet widely understood customs. This system is supported by the principle of no matter how little you have, you give, and is held together by loose but binding agreements about terms and conditions. Although this kind of philanthropy is informal and unofficial, it is neither disorderly nor random and is held together by widely accepted ways of behaving, using shared principles and conventions.
- Philosophy of the collective self refers to the understanding that people do not exist in isolation, as expressed in the moral philosophy of 'Ubuntu'. Schools and higher education communities thus realise that they exist not because and only for themselves, but because of who they are in relation to others.

The two paradigms within the philanthropy of community approach refer to the asset-based approach to development, which is an alternative to the needs-based approach. It focuses attention on and encourages appreciation of the positive assets and strengths in schools and higher education communities. The other paradigm is based on civic-driven change, which approaches communities from a mind-set, that there already is something (development) to build from.

Corporate philanthropy in education might enhance the competitive context – meaning enhancing the quality of the business environment in the location in which it operates by enhancing opportunities for the children of the local surrounding community through improvements in the social and economic context.

Social entrepreneurship is where a strategic service vision, competitive strategy, or strategy for building networks and partnerships can be formulated and managed, with schools as part of the organisational development. Venture philanthropy, also referred to as “high-engagement philanthropy”, regards funding as long term, and provides a large investment of growth capital and strategic assistance. This kind of philanthropy also intends to build organisational capacity and assess the effectiveness of the clients and communities it is serving.

It is evident that in each concept of philanthropic practice outlined in this chapter’s literature review, there are numerous hidden assumptions and various interpretations that one can learn from and relate to in educational philanthropy. Many questions on each understanding extracted from the literature review can still be asked if deeper analysis is still to be continued with. For the purpose of this study it was important to highlight a few current and emerging philanthropic practices as alternatives from which one can draw in the practice of educational philanthropy.

Wilkinson-Maposa (2009:37) contends that organisations have to re-conceptualise the idea of philanthropy as a one-way flow from the wealthy to the poor; re-evaluate what constitutes assets; and learn to recognise helping norms as an asset and agency for poor communities. Funding should be seen as building on what is already there, rather than being the sole provider of assistance. Furthermore, philanthropists will have to recognise the time needed to invest in establishing a trusting relationship with the community and to help them map their assets.

## **5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

My research on alternative educational philanthropy practices is by no means comprehensive and is merely an effort to create a platform and space for those who critically want to think deeper about areas relating to philanthropy. In my personal quest of trying to make meaning of my day-to-day practice, my hope is that this conceptual analysis will provide a framework for continuous critical debates and further research that can “benefit engaging analyses, interpretations and expositions of various ideas” related (Waghid 2002: 233) to educational philanthropy.

Recommendations would be to undertake further research on educational philanthropy from different research perspectives and methods, and understanding the different angles and pathways of philanthropy within the modern educational environment. Furthermore, concepts relating to philanthropy, like ‘community’, ‘indigenous’, ‘inclusion’, ‘exclusion’, etc. are also worth exploring. The concept of indigenous philanthropy emerged throughout my thought and writing processes, and it would be a worthwhile journey to explore and make meaning of what indigenous philanthropy could entail in an African context, and how it relates to schooling and higher education training.

Practising in collaboration with multi-disciplinary stakeholders, together implementing multi-disciplinary programmes in schools, I am also looking forward to being involved in interdisciplinary research outputs on educational philanthropy. Having experience the application of the logic model as a monitoring and evaluation instrument in educational philanthropic projects, I also would like to do research on the evaluation of the logic model.

As is evident from the multiple recommendations, this theme provides many exciting and worthwhile opportunities for analysis, debate and academic writing.

## **5.5 NARRATIVE REFLECTION ON MY STUDY**

During the first year of the structured course work, I thought of many different angles from which to approach my research study. I found it difficult to find the correct angle for my study, as I regard myself as quite pragmatic as a researcher. Finding the time and energy to read was also challenging, but it was the only way to have gained the knowledge and content to write on my research topic. I often write in my daily practice, but found the academic writing quite

challenging and relied on reading other theses and academic literature in order to gain a deeper understanding of academic writing. My supervisor's continuous comments on the content layout and formatting also were valuable. Because of my inclination to 'think practically', I have found 'philosophy' as a discipline quite difficult. Although I grew to like 'philosophising', the academic writing on philosophy of education was quite a challenge.

Furthermore, although I enjoyed the structured coursework, intellectually I initially felt as if I could not connect the coursework content with my research topic. The continued feedback of my supervisor, Prof van Wyk, and advice on how I need to understand philosophy of education and the methods and methodologies that need to be applied in order to do my research, afforded me the right platform from which to start my study. Once I had written Chapter 2, on methods and methodologies, I felt it easier to continue with my other chapters.

The more I read and wrote (sometimes not making sense of what I was writing) I felt almost enlightened ("bevry") by the fact that all the questions on my topic were out of my head and to some extent had a reason or meaning behind them. I felt the challenge of not finding previous research done in Education Policy Studies relating to my topic as among the reasons that slowed down my writing process, and this affected my timeline for my research outputs. Once I dealt with the fact that this is quite an organic piece of research in Education Policy Studies, I started to become comfortable in researching original literature spaces ("oninbeweegde ruimtes"). In the gathering of the relevant literature I found myself gather too much data, which I felt excited about, although it was not always relevant to the purpose of my study. I thus included it in my writing, but had to delete a lot of my writing again ('killed my darlings'), because it broadened my argument and made me lose focus. My supervisor's feedback on my final layout assisted with keeping my research focus aligned to the purpose of my study.

## **5.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

One of my challenges was the fact that there was no or only limited educational literature on philanthropy. Other concepts, like "public-private partnerships" etc., are used in policy documents, but no literature makes clear how and where philanthropy fits into education. I had to rely on other disciplines, like business, and literature on social development to gather my initial understandings of what I wanted to base my study on.

It felt all the time that the available literature and authors on philanthropy did not capture my felt experience of the depth and nature of how educational philanthropy is misunderstood and thus misaligned with the educational challenges. I thus found it challenging to articulate and write about it academically to make my point.

The topic of philanthropy, especially in education, is under-researched, but the fact that I could not find previous research in Education Policy Studies related to this topic also challenged my ability to relate it back to education policy studies.

Although indigenous philanthropy was not a specific focus, the theme emerged and, as with some of my other questions, no relevant literature was to be found specifically relating to philosophical studies on indigenous philanthropy in Africa.

## **5.7 WHAT MAKES THIS RESEARCH IMPORTANT?**

There has been and still is increasing interest from different kinds of philanthropists to contribute to educational development. There are current philanthropic practices that are making huge, constructive contributions, but then there are also practices that disempower educational communities in their development. My biggest contention is not that the latter do not have adequate knowledge and skills about their practice, but that they need a deeper understanding of what the educational challenges entail in order to co-construct philanthropic practices with the beneficiaries of these contributions in order to meet the needs and strengthen the educational beneficiaries. In my daily practice of educational philanthropy, I experienced an increased need to understand what I was busy with, and what I understood it to be in relation to how others understood it to be.

One can only practice that which you have a good understanding of. This study allowed me to gain a better and deeper academic understanding of the concepts with which I engage.

## **5.8 CONCLUSION**

This research study was written in an attempt not only to answer some of my muddled questions from working in the field of educational philanthropy, but also to get closer to the question of what is 'right' and what is 'good' for education. My assumption that the current practices of

philanthropy are needed but not sufficient was confirmed by the literature on current practices. I researched current and emerging philanthropic practices as alternatives to traditional philanthropic practices, and abstracted constitutive meanings that I could relate to educational philanthropy.

This study in no way provides ultimate solutions to current dilemmas in educational philanthropy, but serves as an attempt to provide new ways of thinking about philanthropy through constitutive meanings drawn from alternative practices. Much investigation and sense-making is still needed if philanthropists want to contribute to much-needed educational development efficiently and appropriately.

## REFERENCES

- Anheier, H. & Toepler, S. 2010. *International encyclopaedia of civil society*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- Archambault, R.D. 1965. *Philosophical analysis and education*. London: The Humanities Press.
- Barrow, R. & Woods, R. 2006. *An introduction to Philosophy of Education*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Biesta, G. 2009. Good education in an age of measurement: on the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educ Asse Eval Acc*, 21: 33-46.
- Carr, W. 1995. *For education: Towards critical education inquiry*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Chambliss, J.J. 2009. Philosophy of Education Today. *Educational Theory*, 59(2): 233-251.
- Christie, P. 2008. *Changing schools in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Heinemann Publishers.
- Citadel, 2013. *Philanthropy insights: Perspectives from South Africa*. Cape Town.
- Department of Education Policy Studies. 2013. *PGCE: Philosophy of Education*. Stellenbosch University: Sun Media.
- Everatt, D. & Solanki, G. 2006. *The state of social giving in South Africa*. Centre for Civil Society.
- Fataar, A. 2011. *Education policy development in South Africa's democratic transition 1994 – 1997*. Stellenbosch: Sun Media.
- Fig, D. 2002. *Corporate social environmental responsibility*. *SA Labour Bulletin*, 26(2): 81-85.
- Gill, J. 2002. *Philanthropy – A catalyst for social change – My experience of effective, good philanthropic & grantmaking practice*. Conference presentation. New Zealand.
- Hammack, P.L. 2010. *Identity as burden or benefit? Youth, historical narrative, and legacy of political conflict*. Human Development.
- Heslep, R.A. 1996. Analytic philosophy. In J.J. Chambliss (ed.), *Philosophy of Education: An Encyclopedia*. New York: Garland.
- Hirst, P.H. & Peters, R.S. 1998. *Education and Philosophy*. In, P. Hirst & P. White (Eds.), *Philosophy of Education: Major Themes in the Analytic Tradition*, Volume I, Philosophy and Education. London and New York: Routledge, 27-38.
- Jacobs, A. 2012. *A critical-hermeneutical inquiry of institutional culture in higher education*. Unpublished DPhil dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

- Kuljian, C.L. 2005. *Philanthropy and equity: The case of South Africa*. Cambridge, MA: Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University.
- Lapperts, D.M. 2012. *Forms of discipline practised at the two rural schools*. Unpublished MEd thesis. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Lingard, B., Nixon, J. & Ranson, S. 2008. *Transforming learning in schools and communities*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Mahomed, H. 2008. *Philanthropy and social justice in South Africa: Addressing underlying causes or mitigating impact?* Unpublished Master's thesis. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand.
- Mouton, J. 2001. *How to succeed in your master's and doctoral studies: A South African guide and resource book*. Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Moyo, B. 2008. *Optimizing institutional philanthropy in Africa by 2020*. Discussion paper for the Salzburg Global Seminar.
- Peters, R.S. 1967. *The concept of education*. London: Western Printing Service.
- Porter, M & Kramer, M. 1999. *Philanthropy's new agenda: Creating Value*. London: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Porter, M. & Kramer, M. 2002. *The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy*. London: Harvard Business School Publishing Corporation.
- Power, E. 1982. *Philosophy of Education*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Randolph, J. 2009. A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 14(13): 1-13.
- Reid, L.A. 1962. *Philosophy and education*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Rorty, A.O. 1998. *Philosophers on education: New historical perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Schwandt, T. 1994. *Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry*. Department of Education, University of Illinois.
- Scott, D. & Usher, R. 1996. *Understanding educational research*. New York: Routledge.
- Snyders, J. 2013. *An interpretive study of high school dropouts in the context of a former disadvantaged community*. Unpublished MEd dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Sunday Times. 6 March 2005. Tokyo Sexwale: *BEE is very simple*.
- The South African Institute for Advancement. 2013. *Philanthropy insights: Perspectives from South Africa*. Cape Town: Citadel.
- Van Slyke, D.M. & Newman, H.K. 2006. *Venture philanthropy and social entrepreneurship in community redevelopment*. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 16(3): 345-368.



- Van Wyk, B. 2004. *A conceptual analysis of transformation at three South African universities in relation to the National Plan for Higher Education*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Van Wyk, B. 2006. *Exploring constitutive meanings of educational transformation*. *Interchange*, 37(3): 181-199.
- Waghid, Y. 2002. *Democratic education. Policy and praxis*. Matieland: Stellenbosch University Printers.
- Waghid, Y. 2003. *Education as virtue: Cultivating practical reasoning and compassion*. Matieland: Stellenbosch University Printers.
- Wikipedia. Alternative medicine. [http://www.en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative\\_medicine](http://www.en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alternative_medicine). Accessed 30 October 2013.
- Wilkinson-Maposa, S. & Fowler, A. 2009. *The poor philanthropist II: New approaches to sustainable development*. Cape Town: UCT Graduate School of Business.
- Willis, J.W. 2007. *Foundations of qualitative research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Winch, C. & Gingell, J. 2008. *Philosophy of Education: the key concepts*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Wittgenstein, L. You tube video: Wittgenstein. Accessed 30 October 2013. [https://youtu.be/r0cN\\_bpLrxk](https://youtu.be/r0cN_bpLrxk).